Cyril of Alexandria *Against Julian*

Introduction and Translation

Matthew R. Crawford • Aaron P. Johnson

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA: *AGAINST JULIAN*

In 362/363 the Roman emperor Julian composed a treatise titled *Against the Galileans* in which he set forth his reasons for abandoning Christianity and returning to devotion to the traditional Greco-Roman deities. Sixty years later Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, composed a response. His resulting treatise *Against Julian* would dwarf the size of Julian's original work and in fact serves as our primary source for the fragments of it that have survived. Julian's treatise was the most sophisticated critique of Christianity to have been composed in antiquity and Cyril's rebuttal was equally learned. The Christian bishop not only responded directly to Julian's own words but drew upon a wide range of ancient literature, including poetry, history, philosophy, and religious works to undermine the emperor's critiques of the Christian Bible and bolster the intellectual legitimacy of Christian belief and practice. This is the first full translation of the work into English.

MATTHEW R. CRAWFORD is a professor in the Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry at Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, where he serves as Director of the Biblical and Early Christian Studies Program. He has written books on Cyril of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea, in addition to editing volumes on Tatian's *Diatesseron* and Christian intellectual culture in late antiquity.

AARON P. JOHNSON is Professor of Classics and Humanities at Lee University, Tennessee. He has written extensively on intellectual culture in late antiquity with books focused on Eusebius of Caesarea and Porphyry of Tyre.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA: *AGAINST JULIAN*

Introduction and Translation

EDITED BY

MATTHEW R. CRAWFORD

Australian Catholic University, Melbourne

AARON P. JOHNSON

Lee University, Tennessee

WITH EDWARD JEREMIAH

University of Melbourne

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108485692

DOI: 10.1017/9781108757874

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

When citing this work, please include a reference to the DOI 10.1017/9781108757874

First published 2025

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

A Cataloging-in-Publication data record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 978-1-108-48569-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Lewis Ayres and Noel Lenski
patroni, praeceptores, patres
… affectu fideli.

Contents

Acknowledgements *page ix*

Introduction 1
- The Dating of *Against Julian* 2
- The Historical Context of *Against Julian* 5
- Cyril's Handling of Julian's Text 11
- Cyril's Sources 17
- The Argument of Julian's *Against the Galileans* 29
- The Argument of Cyril's *Against Julian* 36
- The Transmission and Reception of *Against Julian* 49
- The Significance of *Against Julian* 57
- Principles of Translation 60

AGAINST JULIAN

Dedication 67
Book 1 71
Book 2 110
Book 3 158
Book 4 211
Book 5 260
Book 6 301
Book 7 347
Book 8 388
Book 9 439
Book 10 490
Fragments 537

Appendix 579
Bibliography 584

Indexes
Biblical Index 614
Other Ancient Sources Index 623
Subject Index 646

Acknowledgements

We have accrued many debts of gratitude, which can only summarily be noted here. First, we would like to thank Brad Boswell and Edward Jeremiah for hundreds of hours of conversation and hundreds of pages of critical feedback on the translation. Hannah Stork provided useful comments on the Syriac fragments; Adam Carter Bremer-McCollum translated the single Coptic fragment for us. Marie-Odile Boulnois has been a model not only of philological rigor in working with this particular text but also of collegiality; we are grateful for pre-publication material and hours of conversation with her. For valuable observations and criticisms of portions of the text, we thank Wolfram Kinzig, Margaret M. Mitchell, Sarah Klitenic Wear, Volker Drecoll, and Irmgard Männlein-Robert, as well as the research team for the ACU-funded project "Modes of Knowing and Ordering Knowledge in Early Christianity": Michael Champion, Dawn LaValle Norman, Jonathan Zecher, Sarah Gador-Whyte, Michael Hanaghan, and Jonatan Simons. For sharing pre-publication materials with us in advance, we are grateful to Christoph Riedweg, Lea Niccolai, Stefan Rebenich, and Michael Schramm. Brad Boswell provided us with extensive copy-editing assistance to prepare the manuscript for submission to the publisher, and Austin Steen compiled the indexes. Michael Sharp with Cambridge University Press has been an enthusiastic supporter since we first proposed this translation, and Bethany Johnson and Christopher Jackson ably shepherded it through the production process. We are grateful for their patience as we brought this complex project to completion.

Audiences at the Society of Biblical Literature (under the auspices of the Models of Piety in Late Antiquity group, organized by Andrew Jacobs), the North American Patristics Society, and the International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford honed our work on several sections of the translation. We also gratefully acknowledge the generosity

of the Loeb Classical Library Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Appalachian College Association, and the Australian Research Council for providing financial support to bring this project to fruition. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to Mark DelCogliano, who brought the two of us together to pursue this joint enterprise.

Introduction

Cyril of Alexandria was a central figure in many of the theological developments and religious conflicts that challenged the stability of the fifth-century eastern Roman Empire. Crucial moments during his episcopacy (412–44) marking wider and more complex developments may be seen with sharp clarity in the outbreaks of overt violence between Christians and Jews and between Christians and "pagans" in the metropolis of Alexandria during the first years of his episcopal career. Moreover, roughly halfway through his tenure as bishop, he would involve himself in a doctrinal dispute underway in the eastern capital of Constantinople, opposing its bishop Nestorius because he believed the truth of the gospel was dangerously undermined by what he took to be Nestorius' errant Christology. Through the savvy manipulation of ecclesiastical and imperial politics, Cyril succeeded in having Nestorius deposed by the Council of Ephesus in 431, though it took eighteen months of negotiations to restore communion between the warring factions. The result would be a delicate peace that did not last long after his death and a theological controversy over his legacy that would persist for two centuries, with its influence still being felt today.

Much of his vast literary output is of interest to the theologian, while his ecclesiastical-political machinations readily merit the attention of the historian. Yet, amidst his sprawling corpus comprising ten volumes of the *Patrologia Graeca* sits a lengthy apologetic work that has garnered surprisingly little consideration in the scholarly investigation of his place within late antique intellectual, theological, and literary developments. Nonetheless, this largely ignored treatise directed against the long-dead Roman emperor Julian (whose short, twenty-month reign lasted from 361 to 363) is of fundamental relevance for appreciating the interreligious dynamics of Cyril's Alexandria, since it highlights the mutual imbrications of biblical, historical, theological, and philosophical ways of thinking, and allows one to trace a formidable appropriation of the

classical heritage as an expression of the vibrant intellectual culture of late antiquity. Cyril's *Against Julian* (hereafter abbreviated *c. Iul.*) has long been ignored no doubt partly because, until very recently, there existed no translation into any modern language.[1] The present volume represents the first complete English translation of the work, and the following introductory discussions aim to provide several angles by which readers as yet unfamiliar with its nature and importance can fruitfully approach this important and fascinating text.

The Dating of *Against Julian*

According to the tenth-century *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, Cyril composed *Against Julian* after certain philosophers confronted him with the arguments of Julian in circulation among them. The emperor was notorious for having abandoned the Christianity of the emperor Constantine and his sons and reinvigorating worship of the traditional Greco-Roman deities throughout the Empire through a variety of means, including writing a treatise against the Christian faith.[2] Presumably it is to this treatise, known to us as *Against the Galileans*, that the *History* alludes, though its author probably had no first-hand acquaintance with the work. According to the *History*, when Cyril read Julian's arguments, he found them to be "worse even than the works of Origen and Porphyry." Unable to destroy all existing copies of the apostate emperor's treatise, Cyril gained the support of the current emperor in opposing Julian's works and composed "homilies and discourses" against them, a rather vague and expansive gesture that no doubt includes *Against Julian* (and possibly some of his *Festal Letters*, as we shall soon see).[3] While the *History* does not provide greater precision as to the date of Cyril's anti-Julianic activity, it explicitly places it before the outbreak of his conflict with Nestorius, which occurred in 429.

Generally dismissive of any objective merits possessed by the *History*, modern scholarship had until recently preferred a date later in Cyril's episcopacy for his composition of *Against Julian* on the basis of a letter of Theodoret written in 448 to Dioscurus of Alexandria, Cyril's episcopal

[1] As recently as 1999 Robert Wilken could opine, "[in] any list of the most unread major works of early Christian literature Cyril's *Contra Iulianum* would stand close to the top, if not at the summit" (Wilken 1999, 42). Currently the only monograph-length study is Malley 1978, which is largely a summary of the treatise, though see Boswell forthcoming.

[2] For Julian's negotiation of his position vis-à-vis the Constantinian legacy, see most recently Niccolai 2023.

[3] Severus ibn al-Muqaffa', *Hist.patriarch.* 1.12 (PO 1.431–32 Evetts).

successor.[4] Theodoret's letter mentions that Cyril had sent the work to John of Antioch (bishop 429–41) with a request that he distribute it to other ecclesiastical leaders of the East. The scholarly consensus was that this transmission must have taken place in either 434–37 or 439–41, in other words the two periods when Cyril and John would have been on friendly terms. However, Pierre Évieux sagely advised that, when considering the letter as evidence for dating *Against Julian*, we should distinguish between the time of its composition and that of its circulation among the bishops of the East; Theodoret can only be taken as evidence for the latter.[5] Évieux concluded that, although Cyril may have begun composition of the treatise before the Nestorian conflict, he probably continued to work at it beyond the peak years of the controversy and sent it to John in one of the two chronological windows amenable for doing so.[6]

Considerations supporting a later date for Cyril's publication of the treatise, if not the composition itself, have based themselves upon external motivations or constraints and internal features of the text. The former set of considerations would include, on the one hand, the possibility that he may have wanted to supersede the response to Julian that had been written by Theodore of Mopsuestia, who became one of Cyril's primary theological opponents in the 430s,[7] while, on the other hand, the treatise's depth and range would seem to have required an extended period for composition. The latter set of considerations emphasize "stylistic ticks" internal to his corpus, which, while seductive, unfortunately point in different directions. For instance, quite strikingly Cyril avoids discussing the epithet Theotokos ("mother of God") for Mary, in spite of the fact that Julian himself uses the term in his critique of

[4] Theodoret, *Ep.* 83; see discussion by Azéma 1976, 217, with n. 5. The *History* does, however, figure prominently in the discussion of the dating of the treatise in Kinzig, GCS 20, CIX–CXVI. (Please see the note in the Bibliography for an explanation of how GCS editions are referenced throughout this volume.)

[5] For example, when writing to Nestorius probably in the year 429, Cyril mentioned that he had composed his *Dialogues on the Trinity* during the episcopate of Atticus of Constantinople, who held office from 406 until 425 and had held a public reading of the work in the presence of clerics and the laity, but thus far had not "given a copy to anyone" or "published" the book (*Ep.* 2.3 [ACO 1.1.1, p.25.29–32]). This passing reference illustrates both that a gap of several years could exist between a work being composed and when it was "published" and that an author like Cyril had multiple avenues available for releasing a work, from public readings to wider circulation.

[6] Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 15. (Please see the note in the Bibliography for an explanation of how SC editions are referenced throughout this volume.)

[7] In the 430s, Cyril came to regard Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia as the sources of Nestorius' Christology and composed treatises against each of them. Theodore's apology responding to Julian unfortunately survives in only a few fragments. See Guida 1994.

Christian views.[8] This could be evidence for a date of composition before the Nestorian controversy, at which point the term became a shibboleth of Cyril's understanding of orthodoxy. Yet, at the same time, it is also possible that he prescinds from the topic out of awareness that his audience includes the uninitiated (as acknowledged in *c. Iul.* 8.34.24–29 immediately after the relevant passage from Julian). Furthermore, an assertion in older scholarship had claimed that the frequent application of the epithet "all-wise" to the apostle Paul indicates a later date for *Against Julian* (whereas it had seemed to be limited to Moses alone in earlier texts). But this should probably be questioned: while not frequent in his early writings, it is present; and, in any case, the apologetic treatise assigns "all-wise" to a strikingly large number of other figures besides Moses and Paul – from Abraham, Isaiah, John, and God to Plato and even Julian himself (obviously with a good deal of sarcasm in the latter case).[9] Consideration of the relative frequency of other phrases, which earlier scholars thought might confirm a later date, turn out upon inspection to be either inconclusive or even suggestive of an earlier date.[10] The mixed results of stylistic investigation should caution against making any firm judgments of date based on apparent trends in the ebb and flow of Cyril's verbal mannerisms, especially when examining a corpus of diverse texts, from commentary to polemic.

Fortunately, recent work by Markus Vinzent and Marie-Odile Boulnois has provided more definitive results: there are signal similarities in terms of content and wording between *Against Julian* and a small

[8] See Julian, *c. Gal.* frs. 64 and 65 Mas., with discussion by Boulnois 2020b, 169–70.

[9] See Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 40, citing De Durand 1976, 37 n. 1 (which notes that πάνσοφος only occurs twice in *Dial. Trin.*, and even then is not applied to Paul). Yet "all-wise Paul" is not entirely missing from Cyril's early works (*Glaph.* has one occurrence), and its relative omission might be accounted for by considerations other than differences of date. Cf. Boulnois 2020b, 182.

[10] Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 14 n. 2, suggested that analysis of the relative frequency of phrases like καὶ μὴν καί (which we often translate "and indeed also"), πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως (translated variously along the lines of "always and in every way," on which cf. De Durand, 1976, 40 n. 3), and τάχα που (usually translated "perhaps" or "arguably") would prove useful for determining the date of *c. Iul.* Preliminary searches have thus far unfortunately proven inconclusive. *c. Iul.*'s 124 occurrences of καί μὴν καί do align with his *Comm. xii proph.* (122 instances) and *Ador.* (128 instances). *c. Iul.*'s 19 instances of πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως fit roughly with the moderate numbers in *Ador.* (27 instances), *Glaph.* (31 instances), or *Dial. Trin.* (27 instances), but less so with the larger number of occurrences in *Comm. xii proph.* (79 instances) or *Is.* (85 instances). Finally, *c. Iul.* contains 73 instances of τάχα που in comparison with 104 instances in *Comm. xii proph.* or only 40 instances in *Ador.*; *Is.* has the most occurrences (115). Analysis of such figures also has to take into account the varying lengths of these works. The commentaries on the prophets are about 2.5 times as long as the surviving portion of *c. Iul.* (119,000 words for the latter vs. 310,000 for *Is.* and 303,000 for *Comm. xii proph.*), while *Ador.* is nearly twice as long (206,000 words).

number of securely dated *Festal Letters*.[11] The latter is a corpus of letters, one for (almost) every year of Cyril's episcopacy, each of which announced the date for Easter (and thus the commencement of Lent) and elaborated upon pastoral concerns deemed most important at the time. According to Vinzent's useful survey of all the letters, those for the years 424–26 (namely, *Letters* 12–14) evince a marked increase in Cyril's worries over paganism and critiques of Christianity; according to Boulnois, the letter for 427 (*Letter* 15) has unmistakable similarities with the eighth book of *Against Julian* (itself unique within the apologetic work as something of a short Trinitarian and Christological treatise). The identification of parallels between these letters and *Against Julian* appears compelling, and, since the stylistic investigations do not preclude an early dating, we would locate the composition of all (or at least most) of the ten extant books of *Against Julian* in the middle years of the 420s and thus roughly a decade after he became bishop of Alexandria.[12]

The Historical Context of *Against Julian*

As recounted in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates Scholasticus, the early years of Cyril's episcopal tenure were notoriously unsettled.[13] In order to succeed his uncle Theophilus as bishop of Egypt's capital upon his death in 412, Cyril and his supporters had to fend off a powerful competing candidate, the archdeacon Timothy.[14] Furthermore, once he had secured the throne of Saint Mark, he found himself in a series of conflicts with the city's Jewish population and the imperial prefect Orestes, culminating in the horrific lynching of the philosopher Hypatia in March 415, one of the most iconic episodes of late antiquity.[15] The latter conflict is relevant for setting the context of *Against Julian*, because it reveals a simmering tension between Christian and pagan communities in Alexandria that, while at times latent, could on occasion be intense enough to lead to violence.[16] According to

[11] Vinzent 2001; Boulnois 2020b.

[12] Similarly, Kinzig proposes a date between 416 and 428 (GCS 20, CIX–CXVI).

[13] The most thorough overview of late antique Alexandria remains Haas 1997, who surveys the early years of Cyril's episcopacy (i.e., 412–15) on pp.295–316. See also Beers 2020. The historical context of Cyril's *c. Iul.* is also analyzed in Kinzig, GCS 20, CIX–CXVI, CXLVII–CLVII; Kinzig 2020.

[14] Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 7.7.1–5.

[15] On Hypatia, see Watts 2017 and the recent collection of studies in LaValle Norman and Petkas 2020, with bibliography.

[16] Of the large number of studies on violence in late antique Alexandria, see Haas 1997; Hahn 2004, 15–120; Watts 2010; and for a more literary focus, see Arcari 2017. On violence in antiquity more broadly, see Dijkstra and Raschle 2020. For a revisionist account of Cyril's relation to religious violence, see Crawford 2023b.

Socrates' account, when a band of 500 Nitrian monks stormed the city and attacked the prefect, they accused him of being a "sacrificer and a Greek" (θύτην καὶ Ἕλληνα), while Orestes protested that he had been baptized as a Christian by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople.[17] Suspicion about Orestes' religious commitments no doubt stemmed at least in part from the fact that he was "meeting more frequently" with Hypatia, perhaps the most prominent, non-Christian public intellectual at the time.[18] In the much later and overtly hagiographical account of John of Nikiu, this religious point is made explicit: he has Hypatia beguiling Orestes with her magic and convincing him to stop attending church.[19] While the precise details around Hypatia's tragic death remain frustratingly murky, these comments from Socrates and John suggest that the event came about, at least in part, due to a rivalry between Christians and pagans in the city and an attempt by some to ensure that the boundaries between these groups remained clear.

Prior to Hypatia's murder, the most recent episode of conflict between Alexandria's Christian and pagan populations had occurred in 391–92 with riots that resulted in the Christian takeover of the city's Serapeum on the orders of Emperor Theodosius I.[20] The Serapeum was devoted to the Alexandrian deity Serapis and was renowned as the most magnificent temple outside the city of Rome,[21] so its destruction sent shockwaves throughout the Mediterranean world. Cyril must have been an adolescent at the time. In fact, he himself attests to the widespread practice of sacrifice within his own lifetime, writing in book 4 of *Against Julian*,

> even up to our own times they used to sacrifice in every temple, and there was no one among them – small, great, uneducated, wise, those holding the highest office, those in a lowlier position with nothing noteworthy about them – no one who did not practice such shameful and bloodthirsty sacrifices always and in every way.[22]

The use of the imperfect tense (ἐτέλουν) in this passage probably indicates that public sacrifice had ceased by the time Cyril was writing.[23]

[17] Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 7.14.3–4. As reflected in the above passage, the label "Greek" is often taken to denote a purely religious identity in Christian authors of late antiquity; for bibliography and an extended caveat to this interpretation, see Johnson 2012a.

[18] Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 7.15.4.

[19] John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* 84.88. The relevant excerpts are usefully included in Appendix A of LaValle Norman and Petkas 2020, 251–53.

[20] Cf. Haas 1997, 159–69; Hahn 2004, 78–105.

[21] Cf. Ammianus 22.16.12.

[22] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 4.22.9–14. This passage was also noted by Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 19.

[23] See also *c. Iul.* 7.37 where Cyril similarly says ritual prostitution in the temple of Cronus took place "in our own times" (ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς καιροῖς). In describing these events, he uses imperfect verbs (ἐκαλεῖτο, ἔφασαν), as he does in the above passage, alongside a pluperfect (τετίμητο), implying that the practice used to take place but no longer does, at least not openly.

Nevertheless, despite the loss of Alexandria's most famous temple and despite imperial legislation outlawing sacrifice, devotion to the traditional deities continued in other forms. In the section immediately prior to the passage quoted above, Cyril refers to the gods Cronus, Zeus, Ares, Artemis, and Dionysus as "those who are still even now being worshipped."[24] In other words, at the time he was writing, ubiquitous public sacrifice to the gods was still a recent memory, and Alexandria continued to be home to those who maintained devotion to the traditional deities amidst an empire that was resolutely Christian, either by worshipping these deities with other forms of sacrifice that were permissible or by sacrificing in secret.

Moreover, Christians and pagans continued to sit side-by-side in Alexandria's famous classrooms throughout the fifth century.[25] Hypatia's own students included not only pagans but also Christians such as Synesius, who became bishop of Cyrene.[26] The philosopher Hierocles, who stood in the Iamblichean stream of Neoplatonism, studied in Athens but also taught in Alexandria in the first half of the fifth century, being held in high esteem among his contemporaries for his eloquence and probably counting among his students the Christian author Aeneas.[27] The later systematizer of Iamblichean Neoplatonism, Proclus, studied rhetoric, Aristotelian philosophy, and mathematics in Alexandria until he went to Athens in 430–31 to continue his philosophical studies.[28] Ammonius, a student of Proclus, would later return to Alexandria (c. 470) to teach philosophy to an audience of diverse religious beliefs, from Damascius, who would go on to lead the Platonic school at Athens, to the Christian Zacharias, later bishop of Mytilene.[29] Christians and pagans could, therefore, sit alongside one another in the same classrooms in Alexandria well into the late fifth century and beyond, but this did not

[24] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 4.21.5–10. On the fate of paganism during the reign of Emperor Theodosius II, see especially Millar 2006, 116–23. These two passages from book 4 of *c. Iul.* align with Millar's (2006) conclusion that even though there were few reports of mass violence or destruction of temples during Theodosius' reign, "that did not mean that paganism had disappeared as a form of devotion on the part of individuals or of small groups, or in contexts which were not too exposed to Christian observation and pressure" (117). See also Trombley 2001, 1: 1–97; Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 10, 16.

[25] Cf. Haas 1997, 169–72; Vinzent 2000; Watts 2006, 204–31, Watts 2017, 63–78; Kinzig, GCS 20, CXLVIII–CLVII; Kinzig 2020, 119–21.

[26] On Synesius, see Bregman 1982. His correspondence with Hypatia can be found in LaValle Norman and Petkas 2020, Appendix A.

[27] On Hierocles, see Schibli 2002.

[28] On Proclus, see Steel 2010; d'Hoine and Martijn 2017.

[29] On Ammonius, see Blank 2010; on Damascius, see Hoffmann 1994; Van Riel 2010; Ahbel-Rappe 2010, 3–61; on Zacharias, see Greatrex 2018; Watts 2010, 123–54.

preclude the existence of intense dialogue and indeed debate between these religious groups. The texts later written by Aeneas and Zacharias (*Theophrastus* and *Ammonius*), while fictional, testify to the intellectual scuffle that could take place in a classroom as objections, rebuttals, and counterobjections flew back and forth between Christians and pagans over the philosophical merits of Christian teaching in comparison with the tenets of Neoplatonism.[30] On occasion these debates could turn violent, most notably in 486 when a Christian student was attacked for insulting a pagan teacher, resulting in riots and the destruction of an Isis sanctuary in the Alexandrian suburb of Menouthis.[31]

Although we lack sources that provide detailed information about the educational scene in Alexandria specifically for the period of the 410s and 420s when *Against Julian* was probably composed, there is no reason not to assume that the kind of religiously diverse classroom settings we observe in the preceding and subsequent decades were not also a reality in this period, along with the concomitant rivalry between educated Christians and non-Christians.[32] Clues within the text itself hint at just such a setting as the context that provided the impetus for Cyril to take up his pen and oppose the long-dead emperor. In his "Dedication" to Emperor Theodosius II, the bishop explains that the primary audience for his apologetic treatise consists of Christians, both those "whose hearts are fickle and are very easily snatched and carried off to what is inappropriate" as well as "those who have a firm footing in the faith."[33] With his treatise, Cyril explains, Julian "is rattling many people and causing no small amount of injury," including both of the aforementioned groups of Christians, not just those who are weak but even those who are mature in the faith.[34] But it does not seem as if these Christian readers had simply stumbled upon Julian's *Against the Galileans* on their own. Rather,

[30] On Aeneas and Zacharias, see especially Champion 2014. The texts are conveniently available in translation in Dillon, Russell, and Gertz 2012.

[31] On this incident, see Watts 2010. On Cyril's familiarity with the Isis cult, see Pietsch 2023.

[32] An earlier version of the argument of this section was presented in Crawford 2020c and is expanded upon here.

[33] Cyril, *c. Iul.* Dedic.3.10–16. As observed in Kinzig 2020, 122, Cyril's reference to weak Christians "whose hearts are fickle" might be alluding not only to those who were uneducated and lacked the intellectual prowess to respond to Julian but possibly also to highly educated individuals who sought to forge a synthesis of Hellenism and Christianity. Moreover, even if Christians were the primary audience of the treatise, Cyril seemingly envisioned the possibility of a wider readership since at *c. Iul.* 8.34.22–29 he expressly avoids discussing certain topics that would be inappropriate for "the Greeks" to hear, presumably meaning those who have not yet undergone Christian initiation. On the audience for the treatise, see further Vinzent 2001.

[34] Cyril, *c. Iul.* Dedic.4.17–21.

> many of those superstitious persons [i.e., pagans], when they encounter those who have Christ's mindset, are ridiculing them from top to bottom, bringing forward Julian's treatise against us and claiming that it contains an invincible cleverness and that none of our teachers has ever been able to refute or to overthrow his arguments.[35]

Although Cyril does not specify the location in which his Christian followers encountered pagans boasting of Julian's erudition, Alexandria's religiously diverse classrooms are one plausible setting where such discussions would have taken place, though it need not exclude other possibilities as well. Furthermore, the mention of "teachers" in this passage is perhaps significant. Again, Cyril does not specify who these teachers are. They could be Christian professors who taught various traditional subjects, such as rhetoric or mathematics. More likely, however, the reference is to Christian teachers who provide instruction in distinctly Christian subject matter. In a revealing passage, Julian himself in fact had complained about the "school" in Alexandria run by Athanasius, which offers "instruction" (κατηχήσει) and "teaching in the scriptures." So effective is Athanasius' "school," according to Julian, that "many of his pupils" could take his place once he was exiled.[36] Julian seemingly refers here to some kind of catechetical school, though the details of it remain murky. Whatever the case, it is clear that he has in mind an institutional structure under the oversight of the bishop of the city that offers instruction in the scriptures, something we can presume was also operative during Cyril's episcopate several decades later. If so, then the pagan boast reported by Cyril in the above passage probably refers to teachers associated with the church who, in the view of his contemporaries, had never responded to Julian's forceful critique of Christianity.

Presumably Cyril refers again to this same group of contemporary pagans when, early in book 1, he speaks of some who are "seeking to implant into others the sickness of so shameful a superstition," who are like serpents "injecting the poison of perdition into people who are easily led astray."[37] These are, in other words, proselytizing pagans who are engaging Cyril's flock in debate. And a few paragraphs later he once more claims, "the children of the Greeks think highly of their own teachers and suppose they can frighten some people by name-dropping for our benefit the Anaximanders, Empedocleses, Protagorases, and Platos of the

[35] Cyril, *c. Iul.* Dedic.5.1–6. [36] Julian, *Ep.* 111 (p.191.4–14 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 47 [pp.150–51 Wright]).
[37] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 1.2.14–17.

world."[38] The mention of "teachers" here again is striking and suggests that the term "children" is probably being used metaphorically to refer to students, whether those who are currently students or those who once were students and now consider themselves the offspring of their former teachers.[39] Cyril, therefore, in *Against Julian* speaks of Christian "teachers," probably associated with the church, as well as presumably pagan "teachers" and "children" who pride themselves in their allegiance to famous Greek philosophers.

The language of the classroom appears elsewhere in the treatise as well. Notably, Cyril tends to introduce quotations from non-Christian sources by referring to their authors as Julian's "teachers," including Plato, Aristotle, Porphyry, and the Hermetic corpus.[40] Later, in response to Julian's argument that Christians should stick to studying only the Bible if they really think it is sufficient, he remarks that Christians "have no need of external teachers" to become "wise," but they nevertheless investigate "the opinions of the Greeks" since "it is sweet to know all."[41] The last line is a tag from Menander (*Epit.* fr. 2) that, perhaps not coincidentally, was also quoted over a century later in the *Introduction to Philosophy* by the Alexandrian Neoplatonist Elias.[42] Finally, when Julian boasts that the Greeks surpass the Christians in "the spheres of the arts, wisdom, and understanding,"[43] Cyril retorts "there are a very great many excellent teachers of the arts and sciences among us."[44] The context of this line is a contrast between gods who teach arts and sciences and humans who do the same, suggesting Christian teachers might not be specifically in view, though the passage nonetheless shows the relevance of the classroom to the apologetic debate.

These textual clues suggest that contemporary pagans in Alexandria, who were either current or former students of philosophy, were taunting their Christian peers with the fact that Julian's critique of Christianity had never been refuted by a Christian teacher or author. It was

[38] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 1.4.5–8.

[39] See also the mention of the "children of doctors" at *c. Iul.* 8.51.4–5, possibly a reference to medical students.

[40] See, e.g., Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.29.14–15 (Plato); 2.41.24 (Hermes Trismegistus); 2.45.6 (Aristotle); 3.8.1 (Porphyry). Interestingly, this manner of introducing non-Christian quotations becomes less frequent after books 1–3 and disappears entirely in most of the later books.

[41] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 7.17.4–11; see Mitchell 2022.

[42] Elias, *In Porphyrii isagogen* 10.

[43] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 57.7–8 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.24.9–10).

[44] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 7.25.9–10. This line, along with Cyril's appropriation of the aforementioned tag from Menander, complicates Kinzig's portrayal of the patriarch as resolutely opposed to the idea of progress in the arts and sciences (Kinzig, GCS 20, CLIII; Kinzig 2020, 122).

specifically Julian's apparently expert knowledge of the Christian scriptures, a product of his instruction at the hands of bishops, that made him a formidable opponent in the eyes of Cyril's flock.[45] As leader of the Christian community in the city and thus its most prominent teacher, Cyril took up the challenge of offering a response, in so doing contributing to the institutional rivalry between Alexandria's traditional classrooms and the instruction in Christian sacred texts proffered by the church and its intellectuals.

We should, moreover, resist the temptation to reduce Cyril's comments about his contemporary setting to mere posturing on the part of a bishop in need of a safely deceased opponent against whom to burnish his reputation. The Neoplatonist Eunapius of Sardis published his *Universal History* as well as his *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists* around the turn of the fifth century and in both works Julian is the clear hero, representing an alternative future in which the Roman Empire would have returned to paganism, had not the emperor suddenly met his death in the ill-fated invasion of Persia. Moreover, in the Neoplatonic school of Athens, the memory of Julian's reign remained alive until its closure at the hands of Justinian in 529.[46] It is, therefore, eminently plausible that Alexandrian pagans with Neoplatonic sympathies in the 410s and 420s continued to hold the emperor in high esteem and boasted of the erudition and persuasiveness of his attack on the Christian faith.[47] This is the most plausible setting for the composition of a sustained written response that would dwarf Julian's books against the so-called Galileans and would stand as the most extensive engagement with non-Christian philosophy ever produced by an Alexandrian bishop.

Cyril's Handling of Julian's Text

Had it not been for the format Cyril chose for his response to the emperor, nearly all of Julian's text would be lost to us today. Since *Against the Galileans* does not survive in the direct manuscript tradition, we can only access it through other texts that engaged with Julian's work and provide us with fragments and testimonia. By far the majority of these

[45] Cyril, *c. Iul.* Dedic.4.21–23.

[46] Marinus' *Life of Proclus* dates Proclus' death to 124 years after Julian ascended to the throne (*Vit.* 36), and Julian's failed attempt to turn the empire back to the traditional gods is mentioned in *The Philosophical History* of Damascius, the last scholarch of the Platonic Academy (*Isid.* 115A). On the pagan reaction to Julian's reign, see Marcone 2020.

[47] Cf. Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 19; Watts 2006, 202; Marcone 2020; Kinzig 2020, 123.

remnants come to us thanks to Cyril's *Against Julian*, as is evident in the fact that ninety-four of the one hundred and seven fragments in the most recent critical edition of *Against the Galileans* derive from Cyril, while the remaining thirteen come from five other authors (for a table with the locations of the fragments from *c. Gal.* preserved in *c. Iul.,* see the Appendix to this volume). This is because Cyril entered the fray with his opponent in the most direct manner possible by structuring his apologetic rebuttal as a series of responses to excerpts from Julian himself.

This approach marks a contrast to apologetic texts roughly contemporary to Cyril's *Against Julian*, such as Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and Theodoret's *Cure for Greek Maladies*, neither of which engages at such length with a single opponent whose own words are incorporated into the text itself.[48] The closest analogue to Cyril's method is Origen's *Against Celsus* written two centuries earlier, which similarly consists of quotations from that earlier Platonist critic of Christianity followed by Origen's response.[49] Cyril's *Against Julian*, however, is more overtly structured in a manner designed to keep Julian's and Cyril's comments distinct, as though he were an actual interlocutor in a debate. Whereas Origen often incorporates Celsus' words in the midst of his own paragraphs of prose, interspersed with his own commentary, and is not always clear about when he is paraphrasing or quoting verbatim,[50] Cyril's quotations of Julian for the most part consist of verbatim block quotations. Consequently, disentangling Julian's words from those of Cyril is a less complex task than is the case for those of Celsus. In fact, because the textual breaks are usually clear and unobjectionable, scholars since the sixteenth century[51] have inserted the headings "Julian" and "Cyril" into the text for the benefit of readers, a practice that we continue. To be sure, Cyril on occasion departs from this procedure, quoting a line or two from Julian in the midst of his own commentary[52] or summarizing otherwise lost portions of text that he does not quote verbatim.[53] Nonetheless, for the most part he provides the reader with Julian's own words, allowing him, in a sense, to speak for himself before providing his response. Cyril would later adopt this same procedure with

[48] It does seem that Theodoret's apology aims at responding at least in part to Julian, though he never names the emperor. See Papadogiannakis 2012.

[49] See Paget and Gathercole 2021. [50] See, e.g., Origen, *Cels*. 6.49; 6.64; 6.65.

[51] This convention appears in Oecolampadius' sixteenth-century Latin translation and Aubert's seventeenth-century edition of the Greek text, on which see the section "The Transmission and Reception of *Against Julian*" below.

[52] E.g., *c. Gal.* fr. 12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.55.1–3); *c. Gal.* fr. 34 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.23.8–13).

[53] E.g., *c. Gal.* fr. 69 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.13.4–23).

respect to Nestorius' homilies during his infamous conflict with his Constantinopolitan counterpart.[54]

As seen below in the summary of the text, Cyril postpones direct engagement with his opponent until the second book of his treatise. At the outset of book 2, he briefly recounts the methodology he will follow in the remainder of his apology:

> Now we must come to that man's actual book. Setting forth his lines word-for-word, we shall bring forward our own arguments in the order that is required, since we know that we must oppose his accusations in a noble fashion. And since, as I said, in opening his unrestrained mouth he has greatly defamed Christ, the Savior of us all, and hurls abusive statements at him, I will not mention such things. Instead, very sensibly passing over those parts of his book containing statements that might defile someone simply by encountering them, I will rise up against the essential points, showing that he is at every turn someone devoted to mockery and pointless nonsense, who completely lacks the ability to say anything true.
>
> Furthermore, one should note the following. In the first book he proceeds through a great many ideas and does not stop flipping the same points over up and down and going around in circles, and, by inserting also at the middle and the end exactly what he can be found asserting at the start, he reveals that the words of his refutation have been made arguably without any kind of order. For it is entirely unavoidable that those determined to challenge his statements would appear to be constantly talking about the same thing, not once, but many times. Therefore, by dividing his book into an order that is more appropriate and sorting the topics it contains into categories, we will encounter each one, not multiple times, but only once, as far as each requires and with rhetorical skill.[55]

Three aspects of this passage are worth noting. First, Cyril claims to be setting forth Julian's words verbatim. Thus far no one has identified any instances in which this claim might be doubted and so, until evidence to the contrary can be found, we should take Cyril at his word that he is accurately quoting from his opponent. At any rate, if Julian's treatise was indeed being read among Alexandrian pagans (see "The Historical Context of *Against Julian*" above), this would limit Cyril's ability to emend his opponent's text, since his version could be compared with other copies in circulation. Second, Cyril states that he intends to quote

[54] Cyril's *Five Tomes against Nestorius* consist of quotations from Nestorius' homilies, each followed by Cyril's critique. On Cyril's method of responding to Julian, see also Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 59–62.

[55] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.2.1–23.

selectively from Julian's text, omitting portions that directly defame Christ. There are indeed hints at times that he is responding to passages of *Against the Galileans* he has chosen not to quote,[56] but no clear allusions to anything that would fit the criteria stated above, so we can only speculate about what statements have been suppressed. Finally, Cyril complains that Julian's treatise lacks proper order and that, to avoid repetition, he has sorted the extracts taken from it into categories so that he only has to treat each topic once.

By choosing to quote Julian verbatim rather than use polemical paraphrases, Cyril has constrained himself to responding to his opponent's points in their original phrasing in a manner that would seem persuasive to his readers, since they also had ready access to Julian's words within Cyril's very treatise. That is, he has elected to limit his authorial freedom to otherwise misrepresent the viewpoints expressed by Julian or to ignore them and set forth his own views instead.[57] Nevertheless, as Cyril himself admits, his chosen method does not eliminate his own authorial agency, since he is the one who decides which portions of Julian's treatise are quoted, at what length, and in what sequence.

But just how much reshuffling of Julian's fragments did Cyril engage in? The answer seems to be not as much as the above passage would lead one to expect.[58] For the most part he seems to quote Julian's fragments generally in sequence, though of course with omissions along the way. This is evident in the fact that, when Julian refers to topics he intends to take up later, these indeed usually do occur in fragments subsequently quoted by Cyril. For example, in *c. Gal.* fr. 31,[59] he alludes to a future discussion of whether Jesus really is the Son of God, which appears in *c. Gal.* frs. 62, 64, and 79.[60] Moreover, some fragments quoted in succession by Cyril seem to have been directly contiguous with each other in

[56] See, e.g., *c. Iul.* 2.34.1–22, which responds to Julian's mockery of the idea that humanity is created in the divine image in the Mosaic cosmogony, though in the preceding fragment of *c. Gal.*, Julian had simply quoted the passage and offered no commentary on it. Cyril probably chose not to quote Julian's commentary on the Genesis passage so that he could instead focus on his own critique of Plato's *Timaeus* that takes up most of the remainder of book 2.

[57] Cf. Johnson 2020, 226–31. This approach stands in contrast to Macarius Magnes' *Apocriticus*, which creates a fictional Hellenic opponent and puts in his mouth criticisms that may stem from an actual non-Christian source but are entirely recast in Macarius' own diction and framing. Some of the critiques brought by Macarius' Hellene overlap with those of Julian, but *Against the Galileans* was probably not a source for Macarius. For a survey of this question, see Schott and Edwards 2015, 32–35; Goulet 2003, 1: 126–27, 279–87; Bouffartigue 2011, 415–17.

[58] Cf. Boulnois 2020b, 183–84, who arrives at the same conclusion.

[59] Quoted at *c. Iul.* 5.12.2–6.

[60] Quoted at *c. Iul.* 8.1–2; 8.15–16; 10.1.

Julian's original composition.[61] Finally, even the order of the component parts of Julian's treatise seems to have been kept in sequence. In the methodological passage quoted above from his second book, Cyril refers specifically to Julian's "first book."[62] While we cannot be certain that all of the fragments quoted in books 2–10 of *Against Julian* come from the first book of *Against the Galileans*, Julian himself alludes to a future examination of Jesus' discordant genealogies that he intends to undertake in his "second book,"[63] and topics related to Jesus' infancy narratives do indeed appear in the surviving fragments of Cyril's eleventh book.[64] This pattern suggests that, in broad terms, the fragments of *Against the Galileans* quoted in *Against Julian* books 2–10 probably come mostly from Julian's first book, while from book 11 onwards Cyril probably responded to Julian's second book, though it is impossible to be more precise than this, and some degree of reorganization of material could have occurred that is impossible to detect.[65]

Some instances of Cyril's reorganization are easier to identify. For example, *c. Gal.* fr. 4, which recounts several Greek myths, is quoted at *c. Iul.* 2.11 but topically has no relation to the preceding or subsequent Julianic fragments that appear in book 2. In this case Cyril seems to have relocated the excerpt to this place in his argument because Julian's admission in fr. 4 that Greek myths are "unbelievable and fabulous" serves as an effective reply to his demand in *c. Gal.* fr. 3 to know why Christians abandoned Hellenism, which also skillfully turns back upon Julian the criticism voiced in *c. Gal.* fr. 1 that Christians believe in myths.[66] Aside from book 1, which does not quote any passages from Julian, the only book that strikingly departs from Cyril's usual pattern is book 8, the subject of a recent study by Marie-Odile Boulnois.[67] She has highlighted the fact that in this book Cyril only quotes five fragments from Julian, fewer than he does in other books, and that he has carefully chosen these Julianic passages to allow himself to craft book 8 as a sort of dual treatise on the topic of the Trinity (*c. Iul.* 8.18–34) and the incarnation (*c. Iul.* 8.34–51). The unusual character of book 8 is also evident in the fact that it contains the only instance in which Cyril quotes a passage from Julian a second time. He had already quoted *c. Gal.* fr. 46 at *c. Iul.* 6.22, presumably in the sequence where it originally appeared in Julian's treatise, and he now provides a shortened version of it again at *c. Iul.* 8.50

[61] E.g., *c. Gal.* frs. 79; 80 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1; 10.8). [62] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.2.13.
[63] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 64.5–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9–10). [64] Cf. *c. Iul.* frs. 3a; 3b; 4.
[65] Cf. Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 29–30. [66] Cf. Boulnois 2011b, 805. [67] Boulnois 2020b.

since it serves for him as a foil representing the pagan notion of a divine incarnation. However, this pattern in book 8 is an exception to his usual habit of treating the passages raised by Julian seemingly as they occurred in the sequence of *Against the Galileans*, albeit selectively.

In terms of how he responds to a given fragment after quoting it, Cyril tends to be very methodical, addressing in sequence each of the points raised in a passage he has just cited and often reusing the exact terminology employed by his opponent. His response to *c. Gal.* fr. 58[68] is a good example. In this lengthy fragment, Julian raises the following objections, to which Cyril responds in the sections noted in parentheses: the writings of the Jewish prophets disagree with those of Moses (*c. Iul.* 7.29); Christians have adopted impiety from the Jews and vulgarity from the Greeks (*c. Iul.* 7.30); Christians reject other deities even though Moses instructed the Israelites not to blaspheme the gods (*c. Iul.* 7.31); and Christians are lax in their dietary practices and even more vulgar in their morals than the Greeks (*c. Iul.* 7.32–37). In a few instances he treats the topics raised by his opponent in a given fragment out of sequence, but when doing so usually makes sure to return and address the portion he had skipped over. So, for example, in *c. Gal.* fr. 67,[69] Julian first raises the issue of the "sons of God" mentioned in Genesis 6 who mingled with the "daughters of humans" and then points out that Moses never mentions the "Son of God" in whom Christians believe. Cyril initially replies to the latter point (*c. Iul.* 9.3–10) before returning to the first one (*c. Iul.* 9.11–12).

This kind of methodical treatment of Julian's extracts suggests that, despite its intense polemical force, Cyril's apology has been carefully constructed to address what he took to be the most pressing issues raised by Julian's *Against the Galileans*. Moreover, this close engagement with his opponent's actual words turns his treatise into a kind of dialogue, albeit one in which one party is in firm control of how the conversation proceeds. And even though Julian is not present to give a rejoinder to his fifth-century Christian interlocutor, Cyril on occasion provides a hypothetical one for him (e.g., *c. Iul.* 8.22.1–7). The dialogue-like format of the text is also heightened by Cyril's penchant for addressing his interlocutor in the second person, using the ancient rhetorical device of apostrophe.[70] His chosen mode of engagement with

[68] At *c. Iul.* 7.28. [69] Quoted at *c. Iul.* 9.2.

[70] On which see Brüggemann 2020. On dialogue in late antiquity, see further Goldhill 2008; Cameron 2014; Cameron and Gaul 2017; Rigolio 2019. Cyril himself made frequent use of the dialogue format in his works. See Rigolio 2019, 141–50.

his opponent thus not only preserves a remarkable number of fragments from an otherwise lost treatise written by the most prolific and notorious emperor-author of the Roman Empire, but also enlivens the style of the text we read.

Cyril's Sources

When Cyril came to draft his apologetic response to Julian, he had already staked a significant claim to being a master reader of the biblical texts. If indeed his apology was written in the mid 420s, he had already by this point composed several hefty expositions of the Old Testament and possibly his *Commentary on John*. Readers of his polemic against Julian could thus expect a heavyweight in biblical exegesis to be entering the ring to challenge the close readings of scriptural texts within Julian's treatise that had proved so threatening to Alexandrian Christians (a fact that Cyril himself alludes to in the very first sentence of book 1). They would not be disappointed in this expectation. Nonetheless, the showcasing of the voices of others is not limited in *Against Julian* to block quotations from his opponent Julian or the myriad of shorter quotations, paraphrases, or allusions to biblical passages that span the entirety of what remains of Cyril's text.

Rather, a singularly powerful feature of Cyril's apologetic project is his wide-ranging and sophisticated use of pagan sources. A stunning array of quotations beginning chronologically with Homer (over a millennium before Cyril by his own dating of the poet) and reaching down to Porphyry (whose death was only a little more than a century before Cyril became bishop) fill the pages of *Against Julian* and appear to have accomplished a variety of literary and polemical needs.[71] Furthermore, just below the surface of his explicit invocation of named sources there is a clear but complicated engagement with his almost entirely unnamed Christian apologetic predecessors. Careful and painstaking analysis of all of these sources, both pagan and Christian, is ongoing;[72] the survey here can only indicate some of the basic contours of Cyril's negotiations with both sets of sources.

[71] Wickham 1983, xiv described Cyril's extensive incorporation of quotations as resulting in a treatise "stuffed … with a pretentious display of learning."

[72] See especially Boulnois, SC 582, 105–25 and SC 624, 143–216; 2020a; Brisson 2013; Crawford 2020a; Johnson forthcoming; Riedweg 2011.

Pagan Sources

Rather schematically, we might classify Cyril's pagan sources according to the following three categories: the poets, the historians, and the philosophers.[73] Of the poets, we find quotations from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,[74] Hesiod's *Theogony*,[75] an ode of Pindar,[76] a line of Bacchylides,[77] the philosophic poetry of Orpheus[78] and Empedocles,[79] the tragedies of Sophocles[80] and Euripides,[81] a comedy of Menander,[82] a poem of Callimachus,[83] and two Apolline oracles.[84] Frequently, the length of Cyril's poetic quotations ranges from a single Homeric epithet to one

[73] The orators could be added as a much smaller category (although neither is named explicitly): Demosthenes (*De cor.* 208,3–7 at *c. Iul.* 10.13.9–13; 208,4 at 6.28.12–13) and Isocrates (*Or.* 1,31 at *c. Iul.* 9.31.28–29).

[74] **Quotations of a line or more**: Homer *Il.* 9.445–46 at *c. Iul.* 1.37.4–5; *Il.* 20.67–73 at 1.36.10–16 (partially repeated at 1.36.25–28; cf. 2.26.2–5); *Il.* 19.420 at 3.20.36; *Il.* 4.48–49 (= 24.69–70) at 4.15.4–5 (cf. 4.19.6; the single line 4.49 = 24.70 was cited only by Clement, *Prot.* 2.41.3, while shorter phrases in these two lines were more frequently cited (see the references provided in the GCS apparatus); *Od.* 3.6 at 4.15.7; *Il.* 6.58–59 at 6.2.15–16; *Il.* 7.109–10 at 6.32.6; *Od.* 3.236–38 at 6.13.21–23; *Il.* 15.36–38 (= *Od.* 5.184–86) at 10.15.41–43; *Il.* 16.440–43 at 10.15.46–49; *Il.* 22.304–05 at 10.12.14–15. **Parts of lines**: Homer *Il.* 9.497 at 5.17.8; *Il.* 11.514 at 5.20.19; *Il.* 16.433 at 2.4.13; *Il.* 9.499 at 3.4.9; *Il.* 19.420 at 3.20.33; *Il.* 6.236 at 4.36.9–10; *Il.* 9.500 at 4.13.11; *Od.* 7.294 at 7.13.14. **Paraphrases**: 5.32.8–9 contains a close paraphrase of *Il.* 9.534–35. **Epithets**: 1.36.20 (*Il.* 5.831); 1.11.14, as well as 2.4.17–18 and 4.19.4 (*Il.* 19.258 = 23.43 = *Od.* 19.303); 4.21.7 and 5.32.7 (*Il.* 5.53). **A string of Homeric epithets** for Ares occurs at 5.31.4–7 (partially repeated at 4.6.25–26, 28–29 and 5.32.4): Homer, *Il.* 4.441 ("murderous Ares"); *Il.* 5.31, 455 ("blight to mortals," "stormer of walls," and "blood-stained"); *Il.* 5.831 ("rager" and "one born for evil"); see our note *ad loc.* A string of Homeric epithets for Athena occurs at 5.31.8–10: Homer *Il.* 5.747; 8.391; *Od.* 1.101; also Hesiod *Th.* 587; cf. *c. Iul.* 3.2.20 ("of a mighty father"); *Il.* 21.394 ("dog fly making the gods clash in strife").

[75] *Th.* 108–10 at *c. Iul.* 2.25.4–8; *Th.* 126–27 at 2.25.11–14; *c. Iul.* 2.25.16–19 is a summarizing pastiche of Hesiod's *Th.* 133–37; *c. Iul.* 3.2.14–22 is likewise a summarizing pastiche of Hesiod's *Th.* 104, 132ff, 565–87 and *Op.* 50ff.

[76] *P.* 3.55, 57–58 at *c. Iul.* 6.23.26–30 (cited with variants also by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 29.2; Clement, *Prot.* 2.30.1; Eusebius, *P.e.* 3.13.19).

[77] Bacchylides *Pae.* fr. 5.1 at *c. Iul.* 1.4.2 (ascribed to "someone") and available to Cyril in Clement *Str.* 5.11.68.5.

[78] OF 377F Bernabé at 1.35.9–18, 20–24 (= Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 15.1; cf. Riedweg 1994, 11: 332–33); 620F at 1.46.2–4 (this passage had previously been cited by Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 15.2).

[79] Empedocles fr. 31 B 17.4–8 D.-K. (= D 73.236–41 Laks/Most) at *c. Iul.* 2.46.15 (probably drawing upon Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.3, 878a, quoted in Eusebius, *P.e.* 14.14.6); 2.47.2; fr. 117 D.-K. (= D 13 Laks/Most) at 7.35.16–17 (also cited by Clement, *Str.* 6.2.24.3); fr. 128,22–24 D.-K. (= D 25.8-10 Laks/Most) at 9.24.17–19 (also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.14.7, who likewise drew the passage from Porphyry).

[80] Sophocles *Ant.* 264–65 at *c. Iul.* 10.40.39–40; *Phil.* 386–88 at 4.41.8–10; Ps-Sophocles, TrGF 2.618 at 1.44.13–21.

[81] *Alc.* 3–4 at *c. Iul.* 6.23.33–34; *Hipp.* 1058–59 at 10.42.8–9; *Melanipp. Sap.* fr. 4 Jouan and Van Looy (= fr. 483 Kannicht) at 4.28.21–22; *Or.* 413 and 694–95 at 6.2.20 and 9.25.22–23; *Tro.* 65–71 at 5.31.32–42.

[82] Menander, *Epit.* fr. 566.1–2 Kock (= 7.1–2 Sandbach) at *c. Iul.* 7.16.6–7 (also cited by Palladius, *V.Chrys.* 94.12); fr. 2 Sandbach at 7.17.9–10 (see Mitchell 2022).

[83] *Aet.* I fr. 4 at *c. Iul.* 6.10.34.

[84] See *c. Iul.* 5.38.28–29 (= Porphyry *Phil. Orac.* fr. 324 = Eusebius *P.e.* 9.10.4 = Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 24.2); 6.29.17–18 (= Oenomaus fr. 12 Mullach).

or two lines; but, he can also quote up to seven lines of Homer,[85] seven lines of Euripides, nine lines of (Pseudo-)Sophocles, or even ten lines of an Orphic poem. The adoption of poetic material less often stands as mere adornment and instead usually takes on a polemical use against Julian. The God of the Hebrews and Christians stood in strong contrast to the gods of Homer who were "blood-thirsty" or provoked each other to "clash in strife" or "show such excessive hatred."[86] Julian's complaints about Eve as an inadequate "assistant" to her husband Adam were deemed to carry less force in light of Hesiod's depiction of Pandora who had been given to mortal men as a "fair evil."[87] Likewise, Christian veneration of the martyrs who died gloriously was legitimate, in spite of Julian's criticisms to the contrary, since the poets too recognized the need to honor heroes after their death.[88] These are only some of the more notable instances of Cyril's adaptation of poetic material for his apologetic purposes, which is wide-ranging and often unique in comparison with earlier apologists.[89]

Of the historians, *Against Julian* contains material from Herodotus,[90] Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[91] Diodorus Siculus,[92] Abydenos,[93] Alexander Polyhistor,[94] and Senchoniathon (= Sanchouniathon).[95] Cyril cites historians less frequently than the other categories of authors and limits them almost exclusively to his historical survey in the first book (in which he sought to outline the chronological priority of the great figures among the Hebrews relative to those of the Greeks). But some of the historians could receive a role outside of that preliminary historical overview: these exceptions are Herodotus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Senchoniathon (= Sanchouniathon). In these latter cases, the historians function as testimony to particular argumentative claims Cyril makes in response to

[85] *Od.* 20.67–73 at *c. Iul.* 1.36.10–22.
[86] See, respectively, *Il.* 5.31, 455 at *c. Iul.* 5.31.6; *Il.* 21.394 at 5.31.9–10; Euripides, *Tro.* 68 at 5.31.36.
[87] See the summary of Hesiod *Th.* 585 at *c. Iul.* 3.2.22 (although Pandora is not named until 3.5.7).
[88] Homer, *Il.* 22.304–05 at *c. Iul.* 10.12.15–16.
[89] On earlier apologetic engagements with the poets, see Zeegers-Vander Vorst 1972.
[90] Herodotus 2.53.2 at *c. Iul.* 3.3.11–19 (with the exception of the last sentence, this passage of Herodotus was already quoted by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 17.1).
[91] See *c. Iul.* 6.14.21–31 for general references to information about Numa (some of which Cyril misreports; see our notes *ad loc.*).
[92] Diodorus Siculus 1.94.1–2 at *c. Iul.* 1.19.15–19, 21.
[93] FGrHist 685 F 3 at *c. Iul.* 1.7.8–21; 685 F 4 at 1.9.7–13.
[94] FGrHist 273 F 79 at *c. Iul.* 1.7.1–3; 1.9.1–6.
[95] See *c. Iul.* 6.30.9–22; while Cyril cites Clement as offering information about Senchoniathon and the transmission of his text, he does not explicitly state that Clement is the source for the quotation that follows (indeed, the quotation is almost certainly taken from Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.9.29; see our note *ad loc.*).

Julian. Here, they provide proof and color to Cyril's picture of the religious life of the ancient Greeks or Romans: Julian and his supporters could not merely appeal to poetic license as a way to avoid taking Homer or Hesiod seriously, since Herodotus himself had declared they were the teachers of religious ideas to the Greeks and really did believe their subjects to be gods;[96] the apostate emperor should recognize that his own Numa (the legendary second king of Rome) did not set up statues of the gods and instead believed in intellectual, not material, sacrifices;[97] the Greeks (following the Phoenicians) worshipped humans rather than gods, and it was they, not Christians, who were guilty of "humanolatry."[98]

The philosophers receive the lions' share of Cyril's quotational efforts and attention. These include "Pythagoras,"[99] Plato,[100] Xenophon,[101] Aristotle,[102] Alexander of Aphrodisias,[103] Plutarch,[104] Pseudo-Plutarch (= Aetius),[105] Numenius,[106] the *Corpus Hermeticum*,[107] Plotinus,[108]

[96] *c. Iul.* 3.3.7–26. [97] *c. Iul.* 6.14.21–31. [98] *c. Iul.* 6.30.22–24.

[99] *Fr. inc.*, p.186.14–19 Thesleff at *c. Iul.* 1.42.1–6 (also cited at Clement, *Prot.* 6.72.4; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 19.2; cf. Riedweg 1994, 11: 364–66).

[100] See below for references to the numerous quotations of Plato.

[101] Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.3.13 at *c. Iul.* 1.44.22–26. This passage was previously cited by Clement, *Prot.* 6.71.3; *Str.* 5.14.108.5; Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.13.35.

[102] *APo.* 83a32–34 at *c. Iul.* 2.45.2–4.

[103] *De fato* 27, p.53,17–54,2 Thillet at *c. Iul.* 3.9.18–27; *De prov.* fr. 1 Riedweg at 3.13.15–22; fr. 2 at 2.38.17–39.3; fr. 3 at 3.13.23–28; fr. 4 at 4.26.2–6; fr. 5 at 3.9.6–17; fr. 6 at 3.17.4–16; fr. 7 (?) at 5.9.4–10.

[104] *De E apud Delphos* 391f–392a at *c. Iul.* 8.21.4–8; 393a7–393b7 at 8.21.9–18 (Cyril has taken both of these citations from the much longer extract from Plutarch cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.11, specifically 11.11.1 and 11.11.14–15).

[105] *Plac.* 1.6, 879c at *c. Iul.* 2.22.13–18; 1.6., 879f at 2.22.8–12 (= 2.52.21–24); 2.1, 886bc at 2.14.12–22; 2.2, 886cd at 2.15.2–5; 2.3, 886de at 2.15.7–15 (aside from the first sentence, this passage had previously been cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 15.34); 2.4, 886ef at 2.15.18–25 (also previously cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 15.35, with variants).

[106] Fr. 11.3–14 at *c. Iul.* 8.29.4–11 (also cited more fully at Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18.1–3); fr. 12.2–4 at 8.29.12–13 (also cited more fully at Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18.6); fr. 15 at 3.35.11–19, where it is mistakenly attributed to Plato (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18.20–21, from which the mistaken attribution probably arises since Eusebius had just previously quoted a fragment of Numenius at 11.18.19, which had named Plato).

[107] *Ascl.* 29 test. at *c. Iul.* 4.23.13–16; *Corp.Herm.* 11.22; 14.6–7 and 8–10 at 2.22.21–24; 2.42.2–13; 2.42.15–35; fr. 23 at 1.48.15–23 (also cited in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.27 [PG 39.757b–760a]; cf. Crawford 2020a, 245–49); fr. 24 at 1.49.10–17 (also cited in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.27 [PG 39.756b–757a]; cf. Crawford 2020a, 245–49); fr. 25 at 1.43.14–29 (the first line of this passage was also cited in Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 38.2; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 28.4); fr. 26 at 1.44.1–11; fr. 27 at 1.46.9–12; fr. 28 at 1.46.13–18; fr. 29 at 1.46.20–28; fr. 30 at 1.46.30–33; fr. 31 at 2.30.2–8; fr. 32a at 2.30.9–11; fr. 32b at 2.30.13–18; fr. 33 at 2.30.20–25; fr. 34 at 2.31.12–13; fr. 35 at 8.31.18–24.

[108] *Enn.* 5.1.2.1–9 at *c. Iul.* 8.32.6–14; 5.1.27–38 at 8.33.3–12; 5.1.3.4–10 at 8.33.20–26; 5.1.4.12–17 at 8.39.4–10; 5.1.6.39–49 at 8.30.3–12; 5.1.6.50–53 at 8.31.7–11; 5.1.8.6–13 at 4.42.19–25; 5.1.9.5–7 at 2.46.20–22.

Amelius,[109] and Porphyry.[110] Together these philosophers cover a sweep of intellectual history from the fourth century BC to the fourth century AD, although thinkers from the Roman imperial period predominate and the philosophical representation is limited to the Platonic, Neopythagorean, and Aristotelian traditions. Cyril utilized quotations from these authors (or corpora) for both positive and negative apologetic moves within his treatise.[111] These can be highlighted briefly in the cases of two philosophers who hold the distinction of being the most quoted and most incorporated within the argument of *Against Julian*, namely Plato and his latter-day disciple Porphyry of Tyre.

According to an important recent study, Plato is quoted nineteen times while Porphyry is quoted forty-five times.[112] Plato may provide a special case, however: for, unlike Porphyry, whose words seem to be more strictly quoted at length, distinctively Platonic material can come in various forms. If we include smaller units (short phrases or even single, distinctive words) and close paraphrases where, even if we do not find a verbatim quotation, Plato is at least explicitly named as the source and some of his own wording recurs, we arrive at the much larger number of thirty-three Platonic excerpts in Cyril's text.[113] These excerpts occur in six out of the ten extant books of *Against Julian* (namely, books 1–3, 5–6, and 8) where Plato comes in for a somewhat mixed review. Plato's *Timaeus*

[109] See *c. Iul.* 8.44.6–15.

[110] *ad Nemert.* fr. 276 at *c. Iul.* 3.8.3–11; fr. 277 at 3.8.12–19; fr. 281 at 3.19.3–13; fr. 280 at 3.31.10–14; fr. 282 at 3.31.15–28 (repeated at 5.22.2–15); fr. 278 at 5.20.31–33; fr. 279 at 5.21.2–19; *Phil. Hist.* fr. 203 at 1.38.5–16; fr. 220 at 1.43.5–13; fr. 223 at 1.45.10–26; fr. 221 at 1.47.5–9 (and repeated at greater length at 8.27.9–18); fr. 222 at 1.47.18–24; fr. 211 at 6.3.16–24; fr. 215 at 6.5.6–14; fr. 219 at 6.35.4–7; fr. incert. sed. 460 (= *Phil. Hist.* fr. 24 Sodano) at 2.16.24–2.17.6; *V.Pythag.* 48–49 at 1.25.8–29; 27 at 3.21.4–9; 32–33 at 3.21.22–30; 14 at 6.35.15–18; 18–19 at 6.36.7–14; 42 at 9.16.3–17; 39 at 10.19.2–8; 41 at 10.19.8–13; 43 at 10.20.15–22 (repeated at fr. 64b), 28–33 (repeated without attribution at fr. 42); *Ep. Aneb.* fr. 13a Saffrey and Segonds at 4.14.4–6; fr. 62 Saffrey and Segonds at 4.14.7–15; *Phil. Orac.* fr. 324 at 5.38.28–29; *Abst.* 2.34 at 2.37.5–25; 2.41.5–2.43.1 at 4.13.2–18 (the last two sentences are quoted again at 4.23.5–9); 2.53.3b–54.3 at 4.20.2–16; 2.55.3–56.1a at 4.20.17–22; 2.56.2 at 4.20.22–24; 4.13.9 at 5.38.31–36; 2.58.1 at 9.24.2–4; 2.58.4 at 9.24.6–10; 2.27.6–7 at 9.24.12–15; 2.27.7–28.1 at 9.24.17–24; 2.19.4–5 at 9.28.4–14; 2.46.1–47.1 at 9.28.17–27; 2.36.6–37.1, 3 at 9.28.27–35; 2.9.1 at 10.27.29–33.

[111] On Cyril's varied use of philosophical sources in his polemic with Julian, see especially Boulnois 2017.

[112] Schramm 2017, 67.

[113] This number results from analysis of all entries in the GCS index locorum, which contains fifty-three entries (if we remove double listings of single passages; e.g., the phrase occurring at *c. Iul.* 2.26.15–16 is listed as deriving from both *R.* 6.484b5 and *Ti.* 29a1); this list can be reduced to forty-four entries (if we also remove those with Platonic material contained within the fragments of Julian [namely, at *c. Iul.* 2.50.15; 2.31.21–26; 2.31.27–29 (= 2.36.13–14); 2.33.2–20; 2.43.22–23; 2.43.24–26; 2.44.1–5; 2.44.5–7, the latter of which makes allusion to two separate passages of the *Ti.*] or quotations from Plotinus [*c. Iul.* 4.42.20–21] and Porphyry [*c. Iul.* 2.16.25–28]) and then reduced further to thirty-three (if we remove those Platonic allusions in which no explicit naming of Plato occurs, e.g., at *c. Iul.* 2.26.15–16 and 21). See Johnson forthcoming, for further discussion.

receives sustained attention in the second book (where Cyril responds to Julian's own comparison of Plato's cosmogony with that of Genesis) and is criticized for presenting a Craftsman who needed intermediary divinities to accomplish the creation of the physical world;[114] passages emphasizing (sexual) pleasure in other dialogues (whether in general or in the person of Socrates) are castigated;[115] and he is called out for succumbing to the poets' persuasive tales about the gods.[116] On the positive side, Plato could confirm Cyril's claim that scientific speculations were futile;[117] that God, being good, could not be jealous;[118] that martyrs should be honored, since they had died nobly;[119] and most significantly, that the Word is divine[120] and the divinity exists in a triad.[121]

Even if our number of instances of Platonic quotation (or paraphrase) is increased beyond previous counts, it remains striking that Porphyry receives the dubious honor of being the most-cited intellectual whom Cyril employs in his response to Julian, with at least forty-three quotations finding a place within Cyril's work.[122] As the author of a fifteen-volume work *Against the Christians* (of which Cyril shows keen awareness of its reputation but not of its content), Porphyry may at first seem an unlikely witness for the Christian apologetic program of *Against Julian*.[123] And yet, along with some of the quotations of Plato and all those of Alexander of Aphrodisias, Plutarch, and the *Corpus Hermeticum*, Porphyry's texts frequently garner a positive application under Cyril's hand. In addition to fragments confirming such key points as the Christian rejection of blood sacrifices, the articulation of a providential

[114] *Ti.* 41a7 at *c. Iul.* 2.36.17 (drawn from Julian's quotation at 2.33.2).
[115] *Phlb.* 65cd at *c. Iul.* 6.6.4–8; *Smp.* 183bc at 6.6.8–12; *Prt.* 309a at 6.5.29–30.
[116] *R.* 2.365d7–e4 at *c. Iul.* 3.4.3–10; *Ti.* 40e5–41a2 at 3.4.14–17.
[117] *Phd.* 96a5–c7 at *c. Iul.* 5.40.3–20.
[118] *Ti.* 29e1f at *c. Iul.* 2.37.3–4.
[119] *R.* 5.469a8–b2 at 6.28.19–23.
[120] (Ps-Plato) *Epin.* 986c1–7 at *c. Iul.* 8.28.3–8.
[121] Plato (?) *Ep.* 2,312e at *c. Iul.* 1.47.19–21 (and paraphrased at 2.29.17–18).
[122] As noted above, Schramm 2017, 67 arrived at a total of forty-five Porphyrian quotations; meanwhile, Boulnois (SC 582, 120) put the number of Porphyrian quotations at forty-seven. Unfortunately, neither Schramm nor Boulnois provided a list of these quotations. We have counted forty-three quotations (see our footnote above at the first mention of Porphyry); this number does not include instances where multiple sections of a work are included in a single continuous quotation by Cyril or those occasions where Cyril quotes multiple sentences that are not contiguous in his source but are made to appear so in Cyril's rendering; it also excludes the quotation of an oracle found in Porphyry's *Phil. Orac.*, as quoted by Eusebius, since Cyril's quotation is closer to its version in Ps-Justin, where it is not attributed to Porphyry's oracle collection; see *c. Iul.* 5.38.28–29 with note. Our number here can be supplemented by two named allusions to precise passages of Porphyry in which Porphyrian wording is preserved (*Marc.* 1–3 at *c. Iul.* 6.36.4–6; *Plot.* 7 at 8.44.4–6; see our notes *ad locc.*).
[123] Porphyry was equally an unlikely yet favored witness in Eusebius' *P.e.*; see Morlet 2011b.

notion of free will, the transcendence of the divine beyond human comprehension, or the importance of symbolic language in gesturing at higher truths, an otherwise unknown fragment of Porphyry provided Cyril with a startling occurrence of the term "trinity" in a pagan philosophical text.[124] Had Julian been more attentive to "his own teachers" among the Greek philosophers, Cyril avers, he would have been forced to move closer to Christianity rather than rejecting it. While Cyril could temper the positive appeal to the philosophers with critique of those same figures (for instance, he finds their doctrines confused or self-contradictory and their moral lives less than exemplary), their inclusion within the pages of *Against Julian* is noteworthy for its sustained practice of letting them speak in their own words. The importance for Cyril himself of this chorus of pagan philosophical voices becomes clear from the care with which he preserves more than two dozen fragments that we would otherwise not possess and especially from his consistent commentary on these quotations.[125]

The careful appeal to such a vibrant range of classical literature is breathtaking, especially in the pages of an author whose exact educational background lies in obscurity[126] and whose personality is often characterized as belligerent and hostile to those who were not on his side. How did he gain access to all of this literature? A significant part (but only a part) of the answer can be assigned to his dependency upon earlier Christian texts.

Christian Sources

Of Cyril's Christian predecessors, only his fellow Alexandrian, Clement, is named by Cyril himself in *Against Julian* (two other Christians, Eusebius of Caesarea and Photinus are named once each in the quotations of Julian).[127] There are four acknowledged quotations from

[124] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* fr. 221 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 8.27.17); see Boulnois 2020a, 458–62, Boulnois 2021, 211–16, and our note *ad loc.* for discussion.

[125] Cf. our comments above on his preservation of fragments of Julian. Philosophic fragments not found anywhere else are: Alexander of Aphrodisias *De prov.* frs. 1–7 Riedweg (at *c. Iul.* 3.13.15–22; 2.38.17–2.39.3; 3.13.23–28; 4.26.2–6; 3.9.6–17; 3.17.4–16; 5.9.4–10), which otherwise only survives in Arabic; *Corpus Hermeticum* frs. 25[b]–35 (at 1.43.23–29; 1.44.1–11; 1.46.9–12; 1.46.13–18; 1.46.19–27; 1.46.29–33; 2.29.18–2.30.8; 2.30.9–11; 2.30.12–18; 2.30.19–25; 2.31.10–13; 8.31.17–24); Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* frs. 276–82 (at 3.8.3–11, 12–19; 5.20.31–33; 5.21.2–19; 3.31.10–14; 3.19.3–13; 3.31.15–28 = 5.22.2–15); *Phil. Hist.* frs. 203, 211, 215, 219–23, (?)490 (at 1.38.5–16; 6.3.16–24; 6.5.6–14; 6.35.4–7; 1.43.5–13; 1.47.5–9 [=8.27.9–18]; 1.47.18–24; 1.45.10–26; 2.16.24–2.17.6).

[126] On Cyril's education, see: Hardy 1982; Wickham 1983, xii–xvi; Russell 2000, 4–6.

[127] See respectively, Julian *c. Gal.* fr. 53.7 and 64.27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.6.16–17 and 8.16.4).

Clement's *Stromateis* or *Protrepticus* presented in four of the ten books of Cyril's treatise (the third, sixth, seventh, and tenth),[128] while a fifth unacknowledged quotation can be detected in what at first appeared merely to be a quotation of Plato.[129] In this latter instance, Cyril (accidentally?) continues with a full sentence of Clement's own summarizing words following the Platonic material.[130] Without the presence of diacritical marks equivalent to our quotation marks in his copy of Clement, which would have alerted him to the fact that the Platonic quotation had ended, this inclusion of Clement's own words may be a simple mistake. At the same time, Cyril did have independent access to at least some Platonic material, and the possibility should not be ruled out that he liked Clement's words and intentionally preserved them.[131]

This instance of overextending the quotation of a pagan author so as to include the words of his Christian source is striking and indicates that he may have used Clement's writings for some of his other quotations of pagan authors. Robert Grant identified quotations of Alexander Polyhistor, Empedocles, Euripides, and Plato as just such instances of indebtedness to his Alexandrian predecessor.[132] Without Cyril's slip (if that is what it was) we might only conclude that Cyril and Clement had both drawn upon a similar (or the very same) florilegium for these quotations. Instead, it seems that at some point before composing *Against Julian* (it need not have been immediately prior to writing), Cyril had read and (most likely) copied down portions of Clement's writings that he thought noteworthy or useful.

Cyril's relationship to the *Exhortation to the Greeks*, which is attributed to Justin Martyr in the manuscripts and yet is certainly not his,[133] seems roughly similar, at least in terms of quotational dependency.[134] The

[128] *c. Iul.* 3.21; 6.30; 7.19; 10.21.

[129] Plato *R.* 5.475d8–e5 and Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.19.93.3–4 at *c. Iul.* 5.38.11–20.

[130] "For there is no philosophy in geometry's having postulates and theorems nor in music, at least when it is scholastic, nor in astronomy, stuffed as it is with natural, fluid, and merely plausible claims; rather it comes through 'knowledge' of 'the Good itself,' 'and truth' since these [disciplines], while being other than the Good, are nonetheless paths as it were to the Good."

[131] Früchtel 1937, 88–89 identified fifteen passages in Cyril that are (or seem to be) indebted to Clement (beyond another six passages noted in Stahlin's edition of Clement); these include the acknowledged quotation of Clement at *c. Iul.* 3.21.34–37 and the overextended quotation of Plato at *c. Iul.* 5.38.11–20. Of the remaining thirteen passages we can confirm that in eleven of these instances there are significant verbal similarities (while in the two others, there is only a topical connection).

[132] Grant 1964, 270; see also Früchtel 1937, 88–90.

[133] For a compelling argument in favor of Marcellus of Ancyra as its author, see Riedweg 1994, 1: 160–82; Pouderon 2009, 42–46.

[134] See Grant 1964, 270–71 (with 270 n. 2).

adoption of pagan quotations from Pseudo-Justin's text includes Diodorus Siculus,[135] two fragments of Orphic poetry,[136] a fragment attributed to Pythagoras,[137] several lines of Pseudo-Sophocles,[138] some lines of Homer,[139] possibly some lines of an oracle,[140] and a couple of passages of Plato.[141] Moreover, Cyril's adoption of Pseudo-Justin's own lines of argumentation is very close in some instances (to the point of complete plagiarism).[142]

Important questions begin to arise if we consider the somewhat similar quotational dependency evident with respect to a text titled *On the Trinity*, traditionally attributed to Didymus the Blind (an Alexandrian teacher under whom Cyril himself may have studied in his youth).[143] Although scholarly debate remains ongoing (both about the authorship of the text and its connections to Cyril's treatise), it now seems incontrovertible that there is, in fact, a literary relationship between the two texts (rather than the possibility that they merely shared a common source).[144] Furthermore, it is likely that Cyril appropriated quotations of three of his pagan sources from *On the Trinity* and may have also been prompted by

[135] Diodorus Siculus 1.94.1–2, quoted at *Coh. Gr.* 9.3–4 and *c. Iul.* 1.19.15–19. Cyril is almost certainly dependent upon Ps-Justin, since he not only delivers a truncated rendering of the first portion of Diodorus 1.94.2, as does Ps-Justin, but also precedes it with a list of Greek historians which is similar to Ps-Justin (if abbreviated) and seemingly available nowhere else.

[136] Orphica fr. 245 Kern/377 Bernabé (at *Coh. Gr.* 15.1 and *c. Iul.* 1.35.9–24); fr. 299 Kern/620 Bernabé (at *Coh. Gr.* 15.2 and *c. Iul.* 1.46.2–4).

[137] Fr. inc., p.186.14–19 Thesleff (at *Coh. Gr.* 19.2 and *c. Iul.* 1.42.1–6, 6–9).

[138] Ps-Sophocles, TrGF 2.618 (at *Coh. Gr.* 18.1 and *c. Iul.* 1.44.13–21).

[139] *Il.* 9.445–6 (at *Coh. Gr.* 17.2; 24.2 and *c. Iul.* 1.37.4–5).

[140] *Phil. Orac.* fr. 324 Smith (at *Coh. Gr.* 11.2; 24.2 and *c. Iul.* 5.38.28–29; see our note *ad loc.*).

[141] *Ti.* 22b4–5, 6–8, 23c2–3 (quoted consecutively at *Coh. Gr.* 12.3 and *c. Iul.* 1.18.20–25); *Tim.* 27d5–28a4 (at *Coh. Gr.* 22.2–3 and *c. Iul.* 1.30.11–16, 16–20).

[142] E.g., *c. Iul.* 2.17.14–20 and 21–27 consist of either quotation or very close paraphrase of *Coh. Gr.* 6.1.3–10 and 7.1.4–10, respectively. Although Riedweg 1994, 1: 46ff, 75ff, and 11: 235ff argued for a general dependence of *c. Iul.* 2.16.22–2.18.7 upon *Coh. Gr.* 5–7 and, indeed, there is a sharing of the basic claim, it should nonetheless be noted that the precise points actually differ: e.g., Cyril speaks of Plato's thinking heaven was made from four elements mingled with soul (citing Porphyry, fr. 460 Smith) and etymologizing "heaven," while Ps-Justin claims Plato believed God was in the fiery substance; Cyril says Aristotle believed heaven was a certain fifth body without share of the four elements, while Ps-Justin says Aristotle declared in his book to Alexander that God is a certain fifth, aetherial, unchanging body; and so on.

[143] This curious treatise survives in a single manuscript that is missing its opening and concluding pages. As a result, it is formally without a title or author but since the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1769 was known as *De Trinitate* and attributed to Didymus the Blind. However, following the discovery of the Tura papyri in the mid twentieth century, scholarly opinion shifted, with the majority arguing against Didymean authorship. For a survey of the relevant literature and an argument in favor of the traditional ascription of the work to the blind Alexandrian, see Hombert 2023.

[144] See Crawford 2020a for discussion of an identical string of sixteen words at *Trin.* 2.19 (PG 39.732a) and *c. Iul.* 1.24.19–22.

it to return to the original texts themselves to read more widely in them. The overlapping quotations are two lines of Euripides' tragedy *Orestes*, several lines of a fragment of Porphyry's *Philosophical History*, and three passages from the *Corpus Hermeticum*.[145] The most arresting moment in Cyril's engagement with these sources is seen in the fact that his quotation of Porphyry in the first book of his apologetic treatise more or less neatly matches the corresponding quotation in *On the Trinity*, but in a return to the quotation in the eighth book, he extends it at least a full sentence beyond what was available to him in that earlier text while also specifying that it comes from "the fourth book of the *Philosophical History*," a point equally unavailable in Pseudo-Didymus.[146] One way to account for this phenomenon is to see Cyril as having been "encouraged by his reading in Christian books" to acquire the pagan works themselves and do further reading.[147] We should not preclude other possible scenarios, however. For example, a text like Porphyry's *Philosophical History* would plausibly have been available in Alexandria (if not in Didymus' own teaching circle in Alexandria), where it could have served as a useful resource for students of various interests, both theological and philosophical, including a young Cyril who could have copied passages from it in his student days (if he wasn't actually present at Didymus' lectures that formed the basis of the treatise).[148] If so, then his reading of *On the Trinity* at some point proximate to his drafting of the first book of his apology would not have prompted exploration of a new pagan work but rather reminded him of a standard text.[149] Given the limits of our extant sources and the ongoing nature of analysis of *On the Trinity*, we can only offer the possibility here. Further research might determine that in fact the author of *On the Trinity* used *Against Julian* as a source rather than the scenario we have outlined above.

An even more far-reaching quotational dependency is discovered in the relationship between Cyril and his towering apologetic predecessor of a century earlier, Eusebius of Caesarea. Eusebius' writings were in fact a source, not just for Cyril, but also for the other two major Christian apologies written in the fifth century, Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and

[145] Respectively, Euripides, *Or.* 694–95 (at PG 39.440a and *c. Iul.* 9.25.22–23); Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* fr. 221 Smith (at PG 39.760b and *c. Iul.* 1.47.5–9); *Corp.Herm.* frs. 23–24 (at PG 39.757b–760a and 756b–757a and *c. Iul.* 1.48.15–19, 20–23 and 1.49.10–17).

[146] *c. Iul.* 8.27.8–18; see Boulnois, SC 624, 196–201.

[147] So Grant 1964, 271.

[148] See Crawford 2020a.

[149] After all, it is not often noticed that the first occurrence of this quotation is quickly followed by another fragment of Porphyry not found in *On the Trinity* at all (fr. 222 Smith, at *c. Iul.* 1.47.18–24).

Theodoret's *Cure for Greek Maladies*. On the one hand, in a manner akin to book 18 of Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, the first book of *Against Julian* contains consistent adoption of material from Eusebius' *Chronicon* (a two-part work that compiled chronological material from earlier sources and then marked out a comparative chronology between the various ancient peoples in an extensive table of synchronizations covering over 2,000 years of history).[150] On the other hand, like Theodoret's *Cure for Greek Maladies*, one finds in *Against Julian* a sweeping series of appropriations of pagan material from Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, a massive compilation of verbatim quotations that an earlier generation of scholars had dismissed as a mere apologetic anthology.[151] In contrast to many modern assessments, Julian evidently regarded Eusebius as a formidable critic of paganism, since he attacked him by name in *Against the Galileans* and may have structured his own critique of Christianity around the major foci of Eusebius' apologetic program.[152] Eusebius functioned, therefore, as a significant influence behind both Julian and Cyril.

Cyril's dependence upon Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel* is most obvious in a quotation of Plato's *Timaeus* that he lifted from that earlier apology.[153] As with the Plato quotation from Clement where he had over-extended his quotation to incorporate Clement's commentary as if it were still Plato being quoted, here too Cyril appears to quote a sentence of Eusebius following a citation of Plato. The issue is somewhat more complicated this time, however, since it is only a very short sentence (unlike the longer one from Clement) and it is reworded either intentionally or unintentionally so as to make greater sense within Cyril's own text.[154] Cyril's dependency upon the earlier apologist is also shown unmistakably in several instances where his ordering of quotations or pairing of them with key biblical passages follows that of Eusebius. For instance, at one point a quotation of Plato's *Phaedo* is preceded by quotations of

[150] See Crawford 2020b. [151] For its genre, see Johnson 2006b.

[152] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 53.7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.6.16–17), which alludes to *P.e.* 11.5.5, 7. For Eusebius' and Julian's structuring principles, see the following section of this Introduction on Julian's argument. New evidence that Julian was also responding to Eusebius' *Gospel Problems and Solutions* is presented in Crawford 2023a.

[153] *Tim.* 31a1–5 and Eusebius *P.e.* 11.13.3 at *c. Iul.* 8.21.20–25.

[154] Eusebius' line "It is clear that he knows one God" (Δῆλος δέ ἐστιν ἕνα θεὸν εἰδώς, which is the rendering the GCS offers in spite of the mss of Cyril) becomes in Cyril "One account/reason recognizes one God" (or, as we have rendered it in the translation, "There is a single account that knows a single God," Λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰς [Boulnois: εἷς] ἕνα θεὸν εἰδώς). Reasons for adopting Boulnois' reading are provided at our note *ad loc*.

Xenophon's *Memorabilia* 1.1.11 and 13, just as in Eusebius.[155] Or, at another point a quotation of Plutarch's *On the E at Delphi* follows quotations of Psalm 101:28 and Exodus 3:14, just as in Eusebius.[156]

These patterns in quotational clusters would seem to prove with some surety that Cyril had drawn the pagan quotations in question from Eusebius, and it allows for the possibility that lone quotations elsewhere in *Against Julian* which can be matched in Eusebius' text are likewise borrowed from that apologetic predecessor. As becomes evident from closer analysis, however, we should register a note of caution before glibly supposing that Cyril uncritically or uncreatively adopted material from Eusebius' *Preparation*. Rather, Cyril is unique in two ways: he sometimes supplements the quotations with preceding or subsequent lines of the pagan source text that were missing in Eusebius or even adds entirely new passages from those same pagan texts, which seem to be cited by no prior Christian author. Moreover, even when his quotations are more or less identical to Eusebius (or other Christian sources for that matter), he adds introductory remarks about them so as to provide information not available in Eusebius (such as book titles or numbers and biographical details),[157] and he puts them to different uses within his argument.[158] The complex nature of Cyril's dependency upon and addition to Eusebius can be illustrated by tracking his quotations from Plotinus in book 8. At *c. Iul.* 8.30 he first quotes a passage from the Neoplatonist that overlaps with but extends several lines beyond a portion already excerpted by Eusebius (*P.e.* 11.17.7) and at 8.31 quotes another passage previously highlighted by his apologetic predecessor (*P.e.* 11.17.8), though abbreviating it somewhat. In light of other common sources quoted in this section of book 8 (e.g., Numenius, quoted in *P.e.* 11.18.1–3, 6 and *c. Iul.* 8.29), we can be assured that Cyril was following Eusebius in quoting these first two Plotinian passages, even when he took care to include more of the original source than the Caesarean had in the first instance. However, in

[155] The quotation of Plato's *Phaedo* occurs at *c. Iul.* 5.40.3–20 and *P.e.* 1.8.17–18 (cf. Theodoret, *Affect.* 4.27–28).

[156] The quotations of Plutarch occur at *c. Iul.* 8.21.4–8, 9–18 and *P.e.* 11.11.1, 14–15; for discussion, see Boulnois, SC 624, 150.

[157] See, e.g., his description of Amelius before quoting a fragment already available from Eusebius: "Amelius the Platonist, whose *floruit* coincided with Plotinus and Gentilianus at Rome (for this is what Porphyry says about them)" (*c. Iul.* 8.44.4–6, drawing upon Porphyry, *Plot.* 7, which was not available in Eusebius).

[158] As Marie-Odile Boulnois has demonstrated in several instances, even when Cyril adopts the same amount of quoted material as one of these other Christian texts, he repeatedly evinces a clear independence from his fellow Christians in the points he is seeking to make through these quotations; see e.g., SC 624, 146; 150–51; 152–53; 155–57.

c. Iul. 8.32–33 and 8.39 Cyril goes on to cite four further passages from elsewhere in this section of Plotinus' *Enneads* that neither Eusebius nor any other prior author had quoted, seemingly based on his own reading.

The brief considerations offered here gesture at a thinker who was at once self-consciously rooted within an ongoing discourse of Christian apologetics with its strategic appropriation of pagan material, and at the same time show Cyril to be a creative and fresh interlocutor conversant with many voices of the pagan intellectual traditions. We thus owe to *Against Julian* not only the preservation of verbatim material of great interest, which would otherwise be lost to us, but also the exhibition of an exquisite snapshot of the vibrant Alexandrian context of dialogue and debate that must be integral to any historical appreciation of the early fifth-century religious milieu.

The Argument of Julian's *Against the Galileans*

Although it possesses obvious import for our appreciation of Julian's brief but tense stay in Antioch where it was composed in the winter of 362–63, as well as his literary, philosophical, and religious thought, there is nevertheless much that we do not know about the argumentation and scope of *Against the Galileans*. Frustratingly few references to the work survive. For example, Gregory of Nazianzus shows no awareness of it, despite having composed two lengthy orations attacking the recently deceased emperor (*Or.* 4 and 5).[159] Aside from those works written in direct response to Julian's treatise (and Cyril's is the only one of these to survive in anything like its original form), only two other ancient texts mention it. In his funeral oration for the emperor, his coreligionist Libanius states,

> As winter lengthened the nights, besides many other fine compositions, he attacked the books in which that fellow from Palestine is claimed to be a god and son of god. In a long polemic and by dint of forceful argument, he proved such claims to be stupid, idle chatter. On the same subject he showed himself wiser than the old sage from Tyre [i.e. Porphyry]: and right pleased and happy may this Tyrian be to accept this statement, beaten as it were by his son.[160]

The most that can be gleaned from this passing reference is that Julian attacked the Christians' sacred texts and the deity of Jesus, features

[159] On which see Elm 2012, chapters 8 and 10. For a survey of the Christian writings written in response to Julian prior to Cyril, see Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 52–58.

[160] Libanius, *Or.* 18.178 (trans. Norman 1969, 397).

which do indeed accurately characterize its surviving portions. Some scholars have attempted on the basis of the above passage to posit that the emperor used Porphyry's own polemical treatise *Against the Christians* as a source for his anti-Christian arguments, though Libanius is unfortunately not so forthcoming about the relation of the two texts.[161]

The only other ancient reference to the text comes from Julian himself, in a letter with its own curious transmission history. A sixth-century doctrinal treatise contains a Latin translation of an excerpt from a letter composed by the emperor to Photinus, a Christian bishop who propounded a controversial Christology (and who perhaps not incidentally is mentioned by Julian in *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 8.15–16]). In the passage Julian praises his correspondent's views in contrast to those of Diodore of Tarsus and then writes:

> But if only the gods and goddesses and all the Muses and Fortune will lend me their aid, I hope to show that [Diodore] is feeble and a corrupter of laws and customs, of pagan mysteries and mysteries of the gods of the underworld, and that that new-fangled Galilean god of his, whom he by a false myth styles eternal, has been stripped by his humiliating death and burial of the divinity falsely ascribed to him.[162]

Though Julian does not specify in what format he intends to critique Diodore's views, the allusion to the Muses points towards a written work and scholars have long assumed, for good reason, that he is referring to his intention to write the treatise we know as *Against the Galileans*. As in Libanius' summary account, here again the deity of Jesus features prominently in the forecasted argument.

With these being our only two ancient references to Julian's anti-Christian treatise, there is no incontrovertible evidence for the work's title or the number of books it originally comprised. Cyril's dedicatory preface to Theodosius II only periphrastically refers to Julian's books "against the holy gospels and against the pure religion of the Christians."[163] Elsewhere in Cyril (and other Christian authors), it is merely designated as the work "against us." Most modern treatments plausibly accept the title *Against the Galileans* (rather than *Against the Christians*) since Julian avoided the label "Christians" with striking consistency and instead opted for the culturally and geographically

[161] See Elm 2017. [162] Julian, *Ep.* 90 Bidez (= *Ep.* 55 Wright).
[163] Cyril, *c. Iul.*, Dedic.4.15–16.

diminutive epithet "Galileans."[164] While it should be remembered how little we know with certainty about the title, we have adopted the standard modern rendering *Against the Galileans*.[165]

Aside from Julian's own reference in one of Cyril's quoted fragments to a "second book,"[166] the only overt evidence in antiquity for the number of books of Julian's anti-Christian treatise is inconsistent. First, in Cyril's opening "Dedication" to Theodosius II, only two manuscripts of *Against Julian*[167] contain the crucial numeral "three" at the mention of Julian's books against the Christians,[168] although this reading receives additional support from marginalia in manuscripts B and Q (which draw upon other manuscript witnesses)[169] as well as the quotation of the passage by Michael Glycas. Secondly, however, two passages of Jerome inform us that it comprised seven books.[170] Scholars since at least the nineteenth century have almost universally rejected Jerome's report and, aside from Jerome's claim that the seventh book contained an attack on the evangelist Matthew's use of Hosea 11:1 (cf. Matt 2:15),[171] there is complete silence in all our sources about any books that may have been written beyond a third (and even for the third book, we are severely lacking in information outside of the evidence noted above). Neumann, who edited the *editio princeps* of *Against the Galileans*, suggested that Jerome mistakenly reported the number seven from his reading of one of the polemics against Julian written by Theodore of Mopsuestia or Philip of Side, which may have extended up to at least a seventh book;[172] Jerome then, not otherwise having direct access to *Against the Galileans* itself, could have erroneously attributed his Julianic material to a seventh book of Julian's treatise rather than the seventh book of the Christian refutation from which it had in fact been drawn. While tempting, this suggestion can neither be affirmed

[164] The epithet "Christians" only occurs once in his corpus, and even there it is limited to a quotation of Titus of Bostra (*Ep.* 114 [p.195.1 Bidez] [= *Ep.* 41 (p.132–33 Wright)]).

[165] See Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 27–29. The title *Against the Galileans* was first adopted for the treatise in the fifteenth century by Johannes Reuchlin; cf. Guida 2020, 91–97.

[166] *c. Gal.* fr. 64.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9); possible hints at the second book at fr. 50.3–4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.8) and fr. 51.3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.1.14). See Riedweg, GCS 20, XCI–XCII.

[167] See Riedweg, GCS 20, XXVII–XXVIII (on ms G) and XLVII–L (on the Capnionean ms).

[168] Cyril, *c. Iul.* Dedic.4.15, with the GCS edition's apparatus; cf. Chronz and Kinzig 2004, 36–8; Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 27.

[169] See Riedweg, GCS 20, XXXVI–XXXVIII (on ms B) and XLIII–XLVII (on ms Q).

[170] Jerome, *Ep.* 70 to Magnus; *Comm. in Hos.* III, 11:1–2 (CCSL 76.121.57–58).

[171] Jerome, *Comm. in Hos.* III, 11:1–2 (CCSL 76.121.57–61) = Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 101 Mas. Cf. Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 26 n. 3.

[172] On Theodore's refutation of Julian, see Guida 1994, 36–66; on Philip's refutation, see Neumann 1880a, 33–36. On both, see Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 55–57.

nor denied given the paucity of our evidence, though an example of precisely this kind of mistake does appear in the church historian Socrates Scholasticus.[173]

It may be troubling that Cyril, our primary (and nearly sole) source for both the precise wording and the general content of Julian's *Against the Galileans*, claimed early on that he could bring himself neither to quote some of the more blasphemous elements of Julian's polemic nor to follow the alleged repetitiveness or disorder of the treatise he targeted (on which see "Cyril's Handling of Julian's Text" above). Nonetheless, we can trace the main lines of its argumentation with relative firmness (even if Évieux may have been too generous in claiming that we have the argument of Julian's first book "as if in its entirety").[174] Julian himself summarizes his overarching critique of Christianity in a fragment presumably from the preface: Christians are guilty of a double-apostasy by betraying the ancestral religious traditions of the Greeks and adopting those of the Jews, only to jettison the latter for poorly invented fairy tales and misleading rituals;[175] at the same time, Christians are guilty of a double-dependency by borrowing, like "leeches,"[176] "atheism from the Jewish villainy, and … a debased and lax manner of life from the apathy and vulgarity among [the Greeks]."[177] Strikingly, such a framework of critique had already been laid out by the unnamed targets of Eusebius of Caesarea in his great apologetic treatise of the generation before Julian's birth, namely the *Preparation for the Gospel*.[178] These anonymous critics (whether real or invented for the occasion by Eusebius) could themselves find a predecessor for their double-apostasy schema in Celsus (as preserved in Origen's *Against Celsus*). Indeed, as noted already, Eusebius is the only Christian apologist to be named in the extant remains of *Against the*

[173] At *H.e.* 3.23, Socrates Scholasticus claimed to be citing a passage from the third book of Julian's *c. Gal.*, when it was instead a matter of a fragment probably from Julian's first book that he took second-hand from Cyril, *c. Iul.* 3.29; cf. Neumann 1880a, 100; also Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 26; Nesselrath 2001, 40 n. 91.

[174] Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 30. For other surveys of Julian's arguments, see Cook 2000, 277–334; Riedweg, GCS 20, XCIII–CVIII; 2020b; Niccolai 2023, 146–55.

[175] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.2–7).

[176] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 47 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.25).

[177] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.11–13).

[178] Furthermore, if Masaracchia (1990, 17–18) is correct to see Julian's fragments falling into the categories laid out by the "tripartite theology" schema (found earliest in Varro, but predating him), then Julian may have adopted such a schema in response to Eusebius' own critique of each of the three categories (the mythic, the natural-philosophic, and the civic-legislative) in *P.e.* 4.1.1–2. It has frequently been thought that Porphyry was Eusebius' unnamed target, but this seems unwarranted; see Johnson 2010, 2012b; Morlet 2009, 44–45.

Galileans,[179] while careful analysis has shown that Julian likewise almost certainly had Origen's apology before his eyes as he composed his polemic.[180] Was Julian, then, merely carrying the hackneyed themes of his predecessors into the new context of a progressively ascendant imperial Christianity? That is, was his *Against the Galileans* just a derivative work, exhibiting in its unoriginality the weakness of a defeated paganism?

Study of Julian's work would suggest the contrary. Patient analysis of the surviving fragments demonstrates, in fact, that Julian seems to have been intentionally and carefully responding to the two apologetic powerhouses of the previous hundred years. Rather than feebly adopting the critiques of Celsus and the anonymous opponents of the *Preparation*, Julian targeted their respondents, Origen[181] and Eusebius. His accusation of double-apostasy (combined with the double-dependency motif mentioned above) appears to have kept its critical eye consistently fixed upon the earlier Christian responses to such an accusation while elaborating that accusation in such a way as to overwhelm their apologetic enterprises. He did so in two fundamental ways: unlike Celsus, he exhibited a thorough knowledge of the Christian scriptural texts, even at the level of noting problems of textual criticism; and unlike Eusebius' anonymous opponents (who may be no more than a literary construct themselves), he would not defend an uncritical acceptance of any and every element of the Greek religious (and literary and philosophical) traditions, but would provide a philosophically defensible understanding of that religious heritage (for instance, quickly accepting that Greek myths were foolish and opting instead for a Platonic understanding of cosmogony). These two ways of meeting the challenges set down by Origen and Eusebius prompted Julian to formulate his attack (at least in what survives of it) according to the following broad outline:

1. Preface and ground rules for debate (preserved in *c. Iul.* book 2): his motive for writing was to expose the "Galilean intrigue" as being without divine origin but instead the result of a "human fabrication," which took advantage of the senseless part of human souls;[182] Christian respondents should limit their answers to the points he

[179] The only other Christian named in the fragments is Photinus (see *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 8.16.6]), though an unnamed "bishop" is mentioned at *c. Gal.* fr. 84 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.18).

[180] It has also been suggested that Julian may have been responding to Pseudo-Justin's *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (perhaps by Marcellus of Ancyra) in his assertion that all humans have a common conception of God and are thus without need of special instruction; see Riedweg 1999, 78–79.

[181] For Julian's concern with Origen's *Cels.*, see Boulnois 2014, 2021.

[182] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 1 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.2.26–30); see Cook 2000, 286–89.

was making and not bring in counteraccusations and so muddle the quasi-judiciary proceedings that his work pursued;[183] his general plan of attack would start with the human conception of God and then proceed to a comparison of Greek and Hebrew teachings on the divine to substantiate the accusation that Christians have committed a double-apostasy (rejecting what was good first in their ancestral religious traditions and then in those of the Jews) and a double-dependency (adopting what was worst from each group).[184]

2. Foundations of rational religion (also preserved in book 2): first, all humans (as individuals and as nations) have some notion of divinity prompted by a "common desire" for the divine, even if precise knowledge of the divine nature is difficult to attain and impossible to communicate to others;[185] second, all humans recognize the visible gods of heaven (even if they believe in others transcending this).[186]
3. Christian apostasy from Greeks: the importance of a comparative approach (*synkrisis*) to the biblical and Platonic accounts of cosmology (also preserved in book 2); problems in the biblical account of the first humans (the creation of woman as an "assistant," the prohibition from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the biblical omission of any account of the creation of lesser divine beings such as the local god of the Jews, and so on; preserved in book 3); a comparative approach to biblical and Greek accounts of national gods as well as to the nations' relative contributions to arts and sciences, along with legislation, governance, and military success (preserved in books 4–7).
4. Christian apostasy from Jews: the importance of a comparative approach to the Old Testament and New Testament, as well as early Christian theologies (preserved in book 8) and rituals (preserved in books 9–10).

Because it seems that Cyril responded to the second book of *Against the Galileans* in his second decade of books (books 11–20, if there even were

[183] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.7.1–8). [184] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.1–14).

[185] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 7.4–8 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.23.6–11), alluding to Plato, *Ti.* 28c3–5; it should be noted by readers of Wright's edition that she diverges at this point from Cyril's ordering of the fragments (which is more faithfully followed by Masaracchia).

[186] Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 7.9–15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.23.13–19); cf. fr. 11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.50.1–20): this common conception was only natural because of the unchangeability of heavenly phenomena. On these fragments, see Riedweg 1999, 74–79.

twenty total), which now survive in only fragmentary form, our knowledge of his argument in that portion of the work is even more spotty. Many of the surviving fragments of Cyril's later books were excerpted by compilers more interested in Cyril's views than the ways in which such views were meant to answer a criticism levelled by Julian. From what we can ascertain in these fragments, Julian certainly seems to have subjected the New Testament itself to a sustained critique in this section (as he hinted he would).[187] We discern, for instance, indications that he was concerned about the nature and duration of the star of the Magi,[188] the apparent need of the Word to experience growth in a body if he was God,[189] Christ's alleged gluttony in comparison with the asceticism of John the Baptist,[190] Christ's fulfilling the law (while seeming to break it),[191] his admonition not to love family more than him,[192] the necessity of Christ's endurance of suffering (and his prayer acknowledging that suffering was "not my will"),[193] or his ability to preach to (and save) those who had already died.[194] He criticized Christ's claim that he would be with the thief "today in Paradise" although he would simultaneously be in the heart of the earth,[195] as well as the contradictions of the evangelists in their resurrection accounts and the genealogies of Christ,[196] the impossibility of a camel entering the eye of a needle and other sayings of Jesus,[197] the Christian practice of praying for those who suffer or pitying evildoers who had fallen into misfortune,[198] and the evangelist John's assertion that "the whole world" could not contain all the stories about Christ if they were written down.[199] Furthermore, Julian seems to have raised yet again the sensitive topic of the Christian veneration of martyrs and Christ.[200]

Thus, in the second book of *Against the Galileans*, it appears that Julian maintained his overall strategy of keeping his criticisms close to the biblical texts (unless this is merely an impression given by the interests and proclivities of our Christian sources). Likewise, some themes remain

[187] *c. Gal.* fr. 64.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9); possible hints at the second book at fr. 50.3–4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.8) and fr. 51.3 (*c. Iul.* 7.1.14). See Riedweg, GCS 20, XCI–XCII.
[188] See *c. Iul.* frs. 3ab. [189] See *c. Iul.* fr. 26. [190] See *c. Iul.* fr. 30. [191] See *c. Iul.* fr. 39.
[192] See *c. Iul.* frs. 40ab. [193] See *c. Iul.* frs.13–16; cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* fr. 8 Guida.
[194] See *c. Iul.* fr. 41. [195] See *c. Iul.* fr. 24.
[196] See *c. Iul.* frs. 28; 75; for another contradiction, cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* fr. 4 Guida.
[197] See *c. Iul.* fr. 43; for criticism of other sayings, see frs. 72–74; cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* fr. 7 Guida.
[198] See *c. Iul.* frs. 54–55. He seems likewise to have criticized the practice of (or theology behind) almsgiving: see *c. Iul.* frs. 31–32, 60–61.
[199] See *c. Iul.* fr. 77.
[200] See *c. Iul.* frs. 64ab; 65; on the veneration of Christ himself, see fr. 76.

constant between his first and second books: the incongruity of Christian teaching and the law of Moses; the problematic status of the cult of the martyrs; the nature of Christ; and the morality that would result from reading the biblical texts. If our Christian witnesses to Julian's anti-Christian polemic are a reliable indication, he seems to have constructed a sustained and coherent critique of Christianity that renders plausible Cyril's claim that it was threatening to Christians, both weak and mature.[201]

The Argument of Cyril's *Against Julian*

Due to its nature as a text responding directly to another text, the flow of the argument in Cyril's *Against Julian* often seems somewhat ad hoc. Answering his opponent point by point naturally required Cyril to track Julian's lead wherever it went, and consequently multiple topics are treated in each book, often seemingly unrelated to one another. Some books are, nonetheless, largely focused around one or two main topics, such as book 2's discussion of cosmology and book 9's examination of Christian observance of Jewish legal regulations. Moreover, at key points of his polemic Cyril limited and curated the quotations of his opponent in order to unfold more methodically his own distinctive historical or theological claims: book 1 does not cite any fragments from Julian, leaving Cyril free to structure it as he saw fit, and it indeed has a clearer sense of progression with explicit transition points; book 8, as noted above, is unique among the other books since it quotes the fewest number of Julianic passages, and those that do appear were carefully chosen to produce a dual treatise on the doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation. For the remaining books, the collection of topics that appear together is not always easily summarized; the following section therefore provides not an outline but more of a play-by-play account of the various issues raised in the course of this debate in order to give prospective readers an overview of the terrain it covers.[202] Since no other summary of the argument of *Against Julian* in its entirety is currently available in English, the specificity of the following overview hopes to be an aid for those readers with more focused interests seeking to locate particular portions of Cyril's argument rather than reading the whole. Other readers

[201] *c. Iul.* Dedic.4.14–23. Smith 1995, 200 is less convinced of the strength of Julian's argument.

[202] Readers should also consult the more extensive summary of Cyril's arguments given by Kinzig in GCS 20, CXXI–CXLVII and the abbreviated English version in Kinzig 2020, 113–17.

may prefer to dive into the apology and read it in its entirety, an experience we highly recommend.

The "Dedication" to Emperor Theodosius II praises the emperor's piety and presents Cyril and his sovereign as engaged in a common endeavor to defend the glory of God against its detractors. The preeminent opponent of Christ's glory is Julian, who is unsettling the faith of Christians with his books. Cyril mentions Julian's early life as a baptized Christian and claims some believe he had a thorough knowledge of the sacred scriptures, though in fact he has entirely failed to understand them. Since Julian's followers are boasting that no Christian teacher has yet responded to his attack, Cyril himself steps into the arena to come to the aid of his brethren in the faith.

Book 1 opens with a contrast between the "wise … experts in the sacred dogmas" who are able to interpret the scriptures rightly and those like Julian who fight against the "dogmas of piety" under the influence of Satan (1.1–3). Cyril then announces the twofold goal of the book, first to demonstrate that Moses is more ancient than the Greek wise men, and second to prove that the Greek wise men agree with one another when they have followed Moses' ideas but fall into irresolvable disputes when they depart from him (1.4). The first objective is undertaken in 1.5–20 and is heavily reliant on Eusebius' *Chronicon* from which Cyril takes passages from the historians Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenos, along with extensive chronological reference points from the birth of Abraham up to the birth of Christ (1.6–16). He then relies on passages and arguments taken from Pseudo-Justin Martyr's *Cohortatio* to demonstrate that the Greeks were aware of wisdom from Egypt and would have learned of Moses' writings (1.18–20). The remainder of the book, devoted to the second half of Cyril's argument, is subdivided into two sections. The first details the theological view held by Abraham and Moses and claims that they both maintained a firm ontological distinction between the one Creator and all that he has made, while also believing the one Creator God is none other than the divine Trinity (1.21–34). The final section of the book aims to examine the theological views held by those persons esteemed by the Greeks. Orpheus and Homer are both said to be monotheists (1.35–37), in contrast to the diverse and incompatible theologies propounded by the seven sages (1.38–40). Moreover, Hermes Thrice-Greatest, Pythagoras, Plato (mediated by Porphyry), Pseudo-Sophocles, and Xenophon all affirmed belief in the one Creator God (1.41–44), while Plato, Orpheus, and Hermes also were aware of the only-begotten Word of God (1.45–46), and Plato and Hermes acknowledged the Holy Spirit

(1.47–49). This proves that, though the Greeks often went astray in their view of God, they were not entirely bereft of the true theology stemming from Moses (1.50).

Book 2 introduces Julian's treatise and lays out Cyril's intended method of dealing with it (2.1–2) and then covers various introductory matters such as the meaning of the term "Galilean" (2.3), myths (2.4–6, 11), Julian's proposed law-court metaphor for assessing Christianity (2.7–10), and Christianity's relation to Judaism and Hellenism (2.11–13). Cyril next turns to the topic that will occupy the remainder of the book, cosmology. He first preempts Julian's praise for Plato's cosmology by laying out a variety of contradictory views on the creation of the world found among Greek intellectuals, drawing upon the epitomized version of Aetius' *Placita* (pseudonymously attributed to Plutarch), Porphyry, and Pseudo-Justin's *Cohortatio* (2.14–17), and then inserts Julian's quotation of the Mosaic cosmology from Genesis 1 to present the alternative, true account, according to which there is one Creator, who is distinguished from everything else that exists, which was brought into existence by him (2.18–21). Hints of the same, correct view are found among the Greeks themselves, including Plutarch (really the epitomized Aetius again), Hermes Thrice-Greatest, and even Julian himself (2.22–23). This Creator–creature distinction central to Moses' doctrine is sharply contrasted with Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Greek practice of worshipping creation (2.24–26). Moreover, his account has the virtue of simplicity, since it does not attempt to explain the incomprehensible process by which everything was made but simply emphasizes that the world came to exist by God's Word, a view confirmed once more by Hermes Thrice-Greatest (2.27–31). Cyril next quotes a lengthy passage in which Julian in turn quotes the famous speech of the Craftsman to the younger gods in the *Timaeus*, and he spends the next several sections critiquing Plato's cosmology, focusing above all on the question of why the Craftsman does not make humanity himself but instead delegates the task to other, lesser beings. To support his case Cyril calls upon another passage of the *Timaeus*, along with Porphyry, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Hermes Thrice-Greatest (2.32–42). Julian's exegesis of the Craftsman's speech is quoted next, to which Cyril responds by reiterating many of the same critiques already voiced, bolstered by passages from Aristotle and Plotinus (2.43–49). A final passage from Julian stating that all humans, including Greeks and Hebrews, naturally came to believe heaven to be God prompts Cyril to emphasize again the basic ontological distinction between Creator and creature, adding that the orderliness

of the creation should lead one to conclude it has a Maker, but not that it is itself divine (2.50–56).

Book 3 continues the debate over the early chapters of Genesis by focusing on the story of the Garden of Eden. In response to Julian's critique of the creation of Eve, who brought not benefit but loss to Adam, Cyril counters, first, by highlighting the problematic nature of Hesiod's account of the making of a woman and its conflict with Plato's *Timaeus*, and then goes on to clarify the type of assistance Eve was designed to provide, namely reproduction (3.1–6). He then introduces a theme that will run as a leitmotif through the remaining books of *Against Julian*, human freedom: God cannot be blamed for the fateful error of Adam and Eve because virtue and vice require the possession of free will, as was recognized by Porphyry and Alexander of Aphrodisias (3.7–10). Julian next raises the topic of God's prohibition upon eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, leading Cyril to defend the necessity of laws for restraining the human inclination towards evil, akin to natural laws that govern the universe and serve as the manifestation of divine providence, as Alexander of Aphrodisias likewise emphasized (3.11–15). Moreover, Cyril proposes that the prohibition served as a constant prompt to the human couple to contemplate their maker, the summit of happiness, a point again made by Alexander, and he cautions against questioning the appropriateness of God's actions, as Porphyry also warned (3.16–19). The topic of the speaking serpent arises next, a phenomenon that Cyril claims should not be surprising, since Greek sources also acknowledge that daemons[203] can make inanimate objects speak, citing examples from Homer, Porphyry, Philostratus, and Isogonus of Citium (3.20–22). The fact that Moses' god bars humanity from knowledge of good and evil is next subjected to scrutiny by Julian, leading Cyril into a digression on human moral psychology, followed by his assertion of a distinction between the knowledge of good and evil and the experience of it (3.23–28). The appropriateness of God's punishment

[203] Here and throughout, we have opted for the Latinized spelling of "daemon" (picked up in older English) for the Greek δαίμων since the spelling "demon" seems limited to signifying the Christian conception that bore an always negative valence (an "evil spirit"), which Cyril would certainly have adopted. Julian, however, along with some other quoted authors (especially Porphyry), speaks of these beings from within the later Platonic framework, with its conception of a divine-ontological hierarchy (intelligible gods, visible gods, daemons, and human souls, with further subdivisions and the inclusion of angels, depending on the philosopher elaborating the hierarchy at any given point) and with its possibility of distinguishing between good and bad daemons. The Latinized spelling attempts (admittedly imperfectly) to allow for the ambiguities and juxtapositions within a single text of both Christian and later Platonic notions.

of the first couple is the "climax" of Julian's argument, which Cyril counters by quoting Porphyry again on the topic of divine judgment (3.29–32). The flow of the argument then shifts direction somewhat abruptly back to Genesis 1. Against Julian's attempt to demote the Mosaic deity to a lower metaphysical rank, Cyril defends at length the claim that he is the highest God, appealing to Numenius for support (mistakenly thinking he was quoting Plato) (3.33–37). The identity of the Mosaic deity remains the focus for the remainder of book 3, with Julian highlighting his limited domain over the nation of Israel and Cyril arguing that, although Israel played a unique role in the divine plan of salvation, God always intended to save all of humanity (3.38–53). The topic of divine jealousy and patience is treated briefly in the book's conclusion (3.54–55).

Book 4 continues the thread of Julian's argument from the conclusion of book 3, with him now setting forth the alternative Greek view of divine providence to show the insufficiencies of Jewish and Christian particularism. Rather than the highest God only being concerned about a single nation, Julian contends that the Craftsman has cared for all humanity by assigning specific governing deities to each one, whose own essence corresponds to the disposition of that nation (4.2). This claim launches Cyril into one of his longest stretches of argumentation uninterrupted by a further quotation from Julian, in which he relentlessly attacks the traditional Greek deities and relies on repeated antithetical arguments to box Julian into a logical corner. On the one hand, a good Craftsman would certainly not have entrusted his creatures to morally corrupt overseers and, on the other hand, the notion that these overseers determine each nation's disposition undermines free will and thus virtue (4.3–7). These deities are in fact fallen daemons who induce humans to worship themselves, unlike the angels, who direct all praise to the one true God (4.8–12). The portrait of these beings becomes progressively darker as Cyril calls on Porphyry and Homer to highlight the daemons' delight in blood sacrifice, and then demonstrates that they even seduced their followers into engaging in human sacrifice, citing as evidence Deuteronomy, various sources previously mentioned by Clement, and Porphyry (4.13–20). As Porphyry and Hermes Thrice-Greatest recognized, piety towards the one true God is the best way to avoid the evil daemons, not apotropaic sacrifices (4.21–23). Julian next highlights the distinct propensities and laws each nation possesses, to which Cyril responds with a robust assertion that all humans have a common nature and the freedom to pursue virtue, since they were made by a good Craftsman, as Alexander of Aphrodisias recognized (4.24–26). He also

draws upon Clement to enumerate a range of famous individuals who defied ethnic stereotypes, calling into question Julian's seeming ethnic determinism (4.27–28). An exchange on the Tower of Babel story and human diversity follows, with Julian emphasizing the limited explanatory power of the biblical account and Cyril asserting once more, first, that human freedom causes diversity, and, second, that God exercises universal providence (4.29–37). Julian then returns to the identity of the God of Genesis, expressing uncertainty about whether he is himself the Craftsman or merely a local deity; Cyril in turn emphasizes Trinitarian monotheism (4.38–39). In the subsequent fragment, Julian extends his providential theory by expanding the levels of divine hierarchy and taking account of natural laws. Cyril reiterates his prior position that diversity is due to human factors, citing Sophocles; he quotes Plotinus to underscore how the moral problem of defective overseers would reverberate all the way up to the highest levels of the Platonic metaphysical scheme; and he argues indignantly that human skin color has no relation to one's mindset or ethical capabilities (4.40–42). A penultimate fragment returns to the Tower of Babel and whether or not Moses believed in a multiplicity of divine beings (4.43–45). In a final passage Julian asserts once more the superiority of his Hellenic theology to that of Jews and Christians, with Cyril retorting that Christ came to redeem humanity from the evil daemons Julian valorizes (4.46–48).

Julian's comparative project continues in book 5, moving on to examine legal matters among the Jews and the Greeks. In response to his sarcastic disdain of the Ten Commandments as banal, Cyril defends their wisdom, especially the prominence they grant to correct worship of the one true God, and he accuses Julian of arrogance in refusing to accept them simply because the precepts they enjoin are also esteemed by other nations (5.1–5). The topic of divine jealousy and punishment for human wrongs next arises and becomes a dominant theme for much of this book. Julian accuses the Mosaic deity of jealousy and impotence, leading Cyril to defend divine impassibility, relying on Alexander of Aphrodisias, and to explain that the Bible predicates emotions of the divine as an anthropomorphic necessity that is pedagogically useful for humanity (5.6–11). After a puzzlingly brief interlude (5.12), Julian presses his critique by highlighting a biblical episode in which God was so angry he was prepared to destroy hundreds of thousands for the trivial reason that a small number worshipped other deities. Cyril replies that apostasy is a serious matter which God punishes for humanity's own good, and that the biblical story in question is actually

evidence of God's mercy, not his harshness. After all, Porphyry likewise recognized that God sometimes removes people for the greater good and that his providential judgments should not be questioned (5.13–23). The aforementioned negative aspects of the biblical deity are, in Julian's estimation, absent from the esteemed lawgivers in his own tradition, such as Lycurgus, Solon, and the Romans. Cyril once more explains that lawgivers, including God, can punish wrongdoing without being subject to the passion of wrath, and he skillfully turns Julian's Hellenic tradition against him by pointing out that religious faults were also punishable in the laws issued by those people, adducing the famous example of Socrates' execution for such crimes (5.24–27); Julian should therefore not be so surprised to see the biblical God acting similarly to restrain apostasy. A further Julianic critique of the negative emotions displayed by the Hebrew deity prompts Cyril to appeal once more to anthropomorphic language and then go on the offensive, citing episodes from Euripides and Homer that reveal the Greek gods acting even more unjustly (5.28–32). In the final two fragments quoted in this book, the focus shifts away from the Hebrews to other nations who, the emperor claims, have received much greater divine gifts, especially the Greeks, who have perfected the mathematical sciences. Cyril appeals to passages in Plato (quoted via Clement and Eusebius) and Porphyry to argue that true wisdom consists in knowing the one true God and living a virtuous life, goals to which the arts and sciences contribute nothing (5.33–40).

The next stage of Julian's comparison of Hellenic and Jewish history expands to take in a range of different professions and individuals. In his opening fragment of book 6 Julian names eight famous individuals among the Greeks, and Cyril systematically takes up the first four with the aim of dismantling their reputation: Socrates (with the assistance of passages from Porphyry and Plato), Plato (using passages from the *Philebus* and *Symposium*), Cimon, and Aristides (6.1–7). In contrast, the lives of biblical heroes were exemplary, and the punishments doled out for crimes, including apostasy, were fair and not so different from the Greeks' own attempts to legislate right religious belief (6.8–9). Julian next highlights famous Greek military and political leaders, with Cyril again offering less flattering alternative character portraits and dismissing much of the stories in question as myth (6.10–11). Jesus himself then takes center stage, as Julian contrasts the limited and parochial scope of his supposed deeds with those of the aforementioned great men, prompting Cyril to emphasize the divine quality of Jesus' miracles, in

contrast to the Homeric gods who are unable to save their own followers from death (6.12–13). Rome itself becomes the focus in the subsequent two fragments, with Julian enumerating the divine gifts bestowed upon the Empire, from the lawgiver Numa to the shield that fell from the sky, and the general Marius. Cyril replies by aligning Numa with Pythagorean-inspired correct worship of the deity; defending the power of the cross and those Christians who draw it on their houses and foreheads; and pointing out that Marius sacrificed his own daughter to the foul daemons (6.14–19). Divination and prophecy as divine gifts are briefly debated (6.20–22), followed by Asclepius, whom Julian takes to be a god born from Zeus, while Cyril dismisses him as a mere human who arrogantly called himself divine and was appropriately executed by God (6.22–24). In the subsequent fragment Julian dismisses Christian piety as mere worship of a Jewish corpse, along with all the martyrs. Cyril explains that, although he was a genuine human who did indeed die, Jesus was also divine, and that Christians do not worship the martyrs but instead honor them as athletes for piety, a practice akin to Greek oratorical contests memorializing soldiers who died at Marathon; moreover, it is in fact the Greeks themselves who have deified humans (for this last point Cyril relies on a confused tradition supposedly from Senchoniathon preserved in Josephus in turn preserved in Clement, though Eusebius is his immediate source) (6.25–30). Next, Julian's disparaging of the low social status of Christian converts prompts Cyril to return to a theme he first enunciated in book 4, emphasizing once more that all humans have a single nature and are capable of virtue, despite external differences or advantages. After all, Porphyry acknowledged the unimpressive backgrounds of Socrates and Plato and said Pythagoras inducted slaves and women into philosophy; in fact Porphyry himself admired his wife's philosophical ability (6.31–36). Political themes take up the remainder of the book. Julian gives a litany of episodes from the Hebrew scriptures to emphasize the paltry political fortunes of the Jews and then points out that Jesus was one of Caesar's subjects, and not a very impressive one at that, since he was unable to persuade even his own family to follow him. Cyril argues in reply that Julian's gods, who have now been defeated by Christ, could not possibly have granted power to Rome to rule; that submitting to legitimate political authority is no moral fault; and that Christ became incarnate in humble circumstances so that people might not be compelled to believe in him by force but be persuaded to do so, and so that no one would mistake him for a deified human emperor (6.37–46).

Julian's comparative project continues in the fragments quoted in book 7, seemingly picking up right where the final fragment of book 6 ended, now with a focus on military success. He contends that the Hebrews had no one who could remotely rival Alexander or Caesar, a point that Cyril regards as entirely irrelevant to the question of deciding whether true doctrine lies with the Christians or the Greeks; he nonetheless makes sure to highlight some miraculous military victories recounted in the Hebrew scriptures (7.1–5). Julian next raises various other aspects of human culture, explicitly rejecting Eusebius' claim that the Hebrews were artistically and intellectually advanced. Cyril once again views this topic as beside the point and emphasizes instead the importance of right doctrine and right living which are found in the Mosaic writings (7.6–8). The subsequent Julianic fragment looks specifically at the case of Solomon. Cyril parries Julian's critique of Israel's wisest king by pointing out that Solomon was not in the first rank of the saints; that he was raised in luxury, which tends to produce moral faults (in contrast to Socrates who exhibited similar vices but had no such excuse); and that he was led to worship other deities only because he was seduced by a foreign woman (7.9–15). A contest of authoritative texts comes next, with Julian arguing that studying Greek literature is capable of leading to self-improvement while Christian sacred texts are unable to offer any benefit. Cyril, expectedly by now, highlights the pure doctrine of God and high ethical precepts evident in the scriptures, which have the added benefit of being written in a register intelligible to all humanity, not just the elite, since eloquence alone is unable to render someone a friend of God (7.16–23). A list of various Greek deities follows, each of whom, according to Julian, preside over a distinct domain of human life; such limited knowledge and skill in fact reveal, in Cyril's view, that these beings are not gods and in many cases are even inferior to humans (7.24–27). Julian then reprises the double-apostasy theme with which he began his treatise, adding further detail about the defects Christians took from the Greeks and the Jews. This leads Cyril to defend Christian opposition to the worship of multiple deities, in accordance with Moses, and the Christian practice of eating all foods since all of creation is good; besides, true defilement comes from moral vice, such as the temple prostitution encouraged by the Greek gods (7.28–37). In a final fragment, Julian attacks the moral character of Christians, basing himself on Paul's description of the Corinthians' pre-Christian life, and mocks the notion that baptismal water can cleanse a sinner. Cyril responds by defending the kindness of Jesus in helping sinners; clarifying that baptism cleanses the soul, not the

body; and emphasizing the magnificence of the salvation experienced by Christians (7.38–45).

The flow of the debate between the bishop and the emperor noticeably shifts upon reaching book 8. It is not clear whether the Julianic fragments included by Cyril in this book originally followed directly those in book 7, although it is likely that they did not, since Cyril has carefully selected the passages to structure the book as a dual treatise on the doctrine of the Word's eternal existence and incarnation. Moreover, the book is framed by a sort of *inclusio*, beginning with Julian's claim that Moses did not prophesy the coming of Jesus and ending with Cyril's lengthy explication of fulfilled prophecies. The first fragment presented in book 8 argues that Moses honored only one God and knew nothing of the existence of the only-begotten Son of God, whom Julian terms a "second God," despite the appeal Christians make to passages like Deuteronomy 18:15, Genesis 49:10, Numbers 24:17, and Isaiah 7:14 (incidentally, all of which were also discussed in Origen's *Against Celsus*). In response, Cyril argues that Moses was a true monotheist, since he believed his God was not merely "pre-eminent" over others but was actually the only true God, and he explains at length how Deuteronomy 18:15 and Genesis 49:10 were in fact prophecies about Christ (8.1–14). In the next fragment, Julian continues his argument that the Jewish scriptures leave no room for worshipping a second god, invalidating the Gospel of John's ascription of deity to Jesus and the Christian practice of referring to Mary as "God-bearer" (*theotokos*). Cyril's reply is the longest single section of this book: he first lays out the logic of Trinitarian doctrine, arguing that it does not conflict with belief in divine unity and simplicity; then he quotes Plutarch and Plato (via Eusebius) to show that the Greeks believed in the oneness of God; next he returns to the Hebrew scriptures to find evidence for the Son's existence therein; he then calls on Plato to show the folly of not believing those who speak authoritatively about God; and finally he returns to the Greeks, quoting passages from Porphyry, Plato and Numenius (via Eusebius), Plotinus, and Hermes and identifying multiple similarities between Platonic theology and what Christians believe about the Trinity (8.15–33). A further fragment, in which Julian once more denies that Mary could be the mother of a God who saves, sets up the remainder of the book. However, rather than launch into a discourse on the doctrine of the incarnation, which would be inappropriate for those who are uninitiated into the church's mysteries, Cyril instead recounts redemptive history, beginning with creation and explaining why the Craftsman himself became a human to rescue his fallen creatures, as

foretold by the Hebrew prophets; in the process he quotes Plotinus to defend the Word's divine immutability even in his incarnate state; Amelius' brief exposition of the Gospel of John's prologue (via Eusebius), to show that even the Greeks did not completely dismiss Christ's incarnation; and finally Julian himself, to set forth his Asclepius-savior myth as a foil. The book concludes with a rhetorically powerful contrast: if Plato said humans should believe the descendants of the gods even in the absence of them providing "plausible or compelling proofs," the Christian account is much more believable, since it relies upon a host of fulfilled prophecies (8.34–51).

Book 9 continues the argument over whether or not Moses believed in the Son of God, with Julian pointing out that Moses rather freely refers to many beings as gods or sons of god, but never speaks of Jesus as such. In response, Cyril adduces a number of passages that, he claims, refer to the Son under a myriad of different titles (e.g., "hand," "arm," "power") and even foretell his incarnation in the flesh (e.g., Jacob's wrestling with God), and then argues that the "sons of God" mentioned in Genesis 6 were not angels, as Julian contends, but righteous humans (9.1–12). The next Julianic fragment, preceded by an unusually lengthy prefatory remark by Cyril, introduces the theme that will dominate the remainder of the book: Jewish religious practice and Christians' refusal to abide by the Mosaic prescriptions. Julian aligns Jewish customs with those of the Greeks and other nations, and specifically argues that the "scapegoat" ritual in Leviticus 16 is in fact a description of an apotropaic sacrifice. Cyril's reply is the lengthiest piece of sustained exegesis of a single biblical passage in all of his treatise. He first takes Julian to task for only reading the passage literally, an embarrassing mistake given that the Greeks themselves highly prize figural language such as hieroglyphs and riddles (with Porphyry summarizing the latter), and then sets forth alternative readings of the Levitical passage that accord with the Pauline "mystery of Christ" (9.13–20). Julian next claims that Moses was in fact an "expert" in sacrifices and that contemporary Jews still practice sacrifice despite the loss of their temple, prompting Cyril to explain that God in fact never desired blood sacrifice (as again Porphyry realized) and only instituted the Mosaic sacrificial system as a mode of instruction particularly suited to the immature state of the Israelites, though he did so in such a way as to wean them off of such material realities and encourage them to see the truth of Christ outlined within. However, now that Christ, the truth himself, has appeared in the flesh, the shadows have been illumined and Christians continue to abide by the Mosaic law but in a spiritual and

intelligible manner (9.21–31). Dietary regulations are the next topic for debate, with Julian denouncing Christian libertinism with respect to food, founded in Peter's vision in Acts 10, and Cyril arguing that the dietary laws of the Pentateuch should be interpreted as representations of various classes of immoral or moral human beings (9.32–38). As he argues in the next fragment, such regulations are, in Julian's view, eternally binding, since Moses did not entertain the possibility of a revision of them or foretell a second law to replace his own. In response Cyril reiterates the Christological transformation of the law, which is indeed eternal, though observed in diverse ways by the Hebrews of old and the Christians of his own day (9.39–45). In the conclusion to the book, three final passages from Julian are rapidly summarized, the first concerning Jewish restriction of sacrifice to Jerusalem; the second arguing that even the Holy Spirit recognized the eternality of the Mosaic law (in Acts 15); and the third highlighting the disagreement between the apostles Paul and Peter. Cyril quickly dispatches these notions by agreeing with Julian's critique of sacrifice being limited to Jerusalem and appealing to the apostles' supremely wise mode of accommodating their guidance and behavior to the specific needs of their audience (9.46–47).

The opening of book 10 goes back to the topic that appeared at the beginning of the previous book, continuing the debate over the ascription of deity to Jesus, though with Julian now attempting to debunk the evidence from the New Testament writings used to support this notion. Julian offers a fascinating and idiosyncratic historical reconstruction of the origin of Christ worship and claims only the evangelist John referred to Jesus as divine, and even he did so with questionable motives. Cyril in reply runs through a litany of passages from the Pauline corpus and all four gospels that, in his view, attribute divine qualities and actions to Jesus and, in some instances, even explicitly refer to him as God (10.1–7). In response to a further attempt from Julian to identify contradictions in the prologue to the fourth gospel, Cyril then clarifies the sense in which Christians can be said to have "seen God" even though the divine remains unseen (10.8–10). The cult of the martyrs is the next topic for debate, with Julian expressing disgust at the fact that Christians have piled so many "corpses" upon the "corpse" of Jesus and Cyril reprising the analogy he drew in book 6 between reverence for the martyrs and Athenian celebrations of fallen military heroes. He adds that the pollution and stench that come from dead bodies are powerless to bring true defilement, which consists of immoral actions, and points out once more the impotence of the Homeric deities when faced with human death

(10.11–16). Julian then proposes that Christians picked up the practice of sleeping among the tombs from the Jews, at which point Cyril goes on the offensive, arguing that the pagan temples were themselves built upon the tombs of human beings, as acknowledged by Dinarchus, Porphyry, and Clement of Alexandria (10.17–21). In the remaining fragments in this book, Julian seemingly returns to the main topic from book 9, namely Jewish religious rituals, which Christians reject. He highlights the use of fire in the sacrifices of Elijah and Moses, and then emphasizes the distinction between Cain and Abel's sacrifice, arguing that God rejected the former's offering because ensouled beings are more valuable than plants. In response, Cyril asserts that the fire of the Jewish sacrifices was a symbol of the divine nature, which is now fulfilled in the light of the Holy Spirit that shines upon the church; in short, as he argued at length in book 9, the types and shadows have given way to the truth. Moreover, the prescriptions for sacrifice in the Hebrew scriptures include the offering of plants, so God must not have rejected Cain's sacrifice on such grounds; rather, he found fault with Cain because God tested his motivation and found it wanting (10.22–30). Circumcision is the next topic for debate. Against Julian's insistence that circumcision in the flesh is what Moses envisioned, Cyril argues that removal of the physical foreskin is pointless and that the rite was always meant to foreshadow the removal of passions from the soul by the Holy Spirit, which is efficacious even if certain people invalidate the gift by failing to use it properly (10.31–36). Abraham serves as the final figure considered in this book, with Julian proposing in two fragments that the patriarch practiced both sacrifice and divination, the latter via stars (Gen 15:5), birds (Gen 15:10–11), and his servant (Gen 24). Cyril offers an alternative take on each of the passages in question: God drew Abraham's attention to the number of the stars, not their ordering or movement; he used an ancient Chaldean oath-making ceremony to confirm Abraham's weak faith; and Abraham's servant did not rely on divination but instead prayed to God to find a maiden (10.37–41). In a brief final paragraph, Cyril says Julian claims he knew he would become emperor due to divination with birds, a notion he finds more worthy of ridicule than serious debate, dismissing it with a skillfully repurposed quotation from Euripides leading into a concluding doxology to the Trinity (10.42).

The surviving fragments from books 11 to 19 are even more difficult to summarize due to their scattered nature. The single most fruitful source for recovering fragments of *Against Julian* is the extensive florilegium known as the *Sacra*. However, in keeping with the interests of the

compiler of that text, most of the passages that it contains are timeless aphorisms that reveal little about the argument of these later books. Some fragments from other sources are, nonetheless, more helpful. The most consistent feature is a focus on the gospels, which aligns with Julian's stated intention that he would cover such material in his second book (cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 64).[204] Some fragments address the infancy narratives (frs. 3a; 3b; 4; 26; 75; 76); others focus on the passion and resurrection accounts (frs. 13; 14; 15; 16; 19; 22; 23; 24; 27; 28; 41); and still others discuss various dominical sayings and episodes (frs. 30; 39; 40b; 43; 45; 52; 61; 67; 72; 73; 74; 77). It is possible that some of the other fragments discussing issues like almsgiving (frs. 31; 32; 60; 61), anger (frs. 38; 48; 49; 69; 70), prayer (frs. 18; 47; 54), and fasting (fr. 55a) were also originally situated in arguments over various passages from the gospels, but this is impossible to determine with certainty. A final noteworthy feature of the surviving fragments is the repetition of some material already presented in books 1–10, such as honoring the martyrs (frs. 64a; 64b; 65) and a recounting of the tombs of Zeus and Dionysus (frs. 42; 64b).

The Transmission and Reception of *Against Julian*

Based upon quotations of *Against Julian* in later sources, we can be fairly confident of the format in which the treatise was published in late antiquity. The late fifth-century *Florilegium Cyrillianum* contains five extracts from Cyril's apology: two come from books 6 and 8 and are said to derive from the "second volume (βιβλίον)" of the treatise,[205] while three passages from books 12, 13, and 14 are said to be found "in the third volume."[206] Similarly, when the Council of Constantinople III cited an extract from Cyril's twelfth book, it too is said to be found in the "third volume" (= *c. Iul.* fr. 13). This format is also evident in the lost *Codex Capnioneus* used by Oecolampadius for his Latin translation; he states that, according to his exemplar, the sixth book of the work was the start of the *liber secundus*, with *liber* here presumably being a translation of the word βιβλίον used in our Greek sources.[207] The fact that books 6 and 8 were in a second volume while books 12–14 were in a third indicates that the treatise was originally grouped together into pentads, each housed in a separate codex.[208] That is, books 1–5 were in the first volume, books 6–10

[204] Quoted at *c. Iul.* 8.15–16. [205] *Flor. Cyrill.* 176; 177 = *c. Iul.* 6.32.29–33; 8.49.1–23.
[206] *Flor. Cyrill.* 178; 179; 180 = *c. Iul.* frs. 8; 15; 21; 24; 25; 26. [207] Oecolampadius 1546, 126.
[208] As argued in Chronz and Kinzig 2004, 41–56; Kinzig, GCS 20, CXVI–CXVIII.

in the second, and so on.[209] The first and second volumes containing books 1–10 of *Against Julian* continued to be copied, and survived to the present day in the direct manuscript tradition. In contrast, the third and fourth volumes containing the later books perished at some point between the eighth and thirteenth centuries and can now only be recovered in fragments from other sources.[210] From the lost books, fragments have survived that are said to come from books 11–19, which may imply there never was a twentieth book. Although Neumann suspected that Cyril originally composed thirty books of refutation,[211] the fact that no trace of a third decade has survived probably means it never existed.[212]

The original circulation of Cyril's lengthy apology is mostly opaque to us, though a plausible scenario has been reconstructed by Wolfram Kinzig.[213] From the aforementioned letter of Theodoret, we know that Cyril sent a copy to John of Antioch so that John could further disseminate the work among "the eminent teachers of the East," a request with which John must have complied, since Theodoret states that he himself had read the work with admiration.[214] In light of the "Dedication" to Theodosius II, we may assume that a copy was sent to Constantinople and stored in the palace library. Finally, a copy was no doubt placed in Cyril's own patriarchal library in Alexandria. Beyond these three presumably complete copies, we have hints of the existence of others. The acts of the Third Council of Constantinople explicitly drew upon a copy of *Against Julian* residing in the patriarchal library in the eastern capital,[215] and a copy was possibly also available in Rome, since the Roman legates at the same council had used a dyothelite florilegium that included an extract from book 12. Finally, because the treatise was used liberally in the seventh-century compilatory work known as the *Sacra* (once thought to be by John of Damascus and now by an otherwise unknown John the Monk), one can posit that *Against Julian* was available in Palestine, possibly at the patriarchal library in Jerusalem or at the Monastery of Mar Saba. The discernible traces of the presence of the treatise in these

[209] This format is in keeping with the fact that books 5 and 10 end with a doxology. The only other book to conclude with a doxology is book 8, which is probably due to its dogmatic content. Cf. Boulnois 2020b, 187.

[210] A note by Cardinal Bessarion (1403/6–72) at the end of manuscript M suggests that he searched for the lost books of Cyril's treatise but was unable to find them. Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XVIII.

[211] Neumann 1880a, 39–40.

[212] Kinzig, GCS 20, CXVII; Évieux in Burguière and Évieux, SC 332, 15.

[213] For what follows, see Chronz and Kinzig 2004, 41–56; Kinzig, GCS 20, CXVII–CXVIII.

[214] Theodoret, *Ep.* 83.128–32.

[215] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 13.

various locales might suggest Cyril took care to send copies to all of the major Christian sees of his day – Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem – though this hypothesis is naturally impossible to confirm.

Although substantial engagement with Cyril's apology is hard to identify in the period of late antiquity, there are clues that attest to its reception among a number of readers already within Cyril's own lifetime. The letter of Theodoret must once again be mentioned here, and the fact that Theodoret claims to have read Cyril's work naturally raises the question of whether it had any influence on his own apology for the faith, *The Cure for Greek Maladies*. Opinion remains divided on the question of whether *Against Julian* influenced Theodoret's treatise or vice versa, and of course hinges on the respective dating of the two works, which is also debated.[216] The argument for some kind of relation between the two texts, or at least a common source used for both, is compelling, since both authors cite a Platonic passage taken from Clement of Alexandria and make the same mistake (if not intentional) of extending the quotation by including the first sentence of Clement's commentary on it (see above on Cyril's sources). Cyril's contemporaries Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus, each of whom composed an *Ecclesiastical History*, also apparently read *Against Julian*, though without acknowledging having done so. Socrates quotes a fragment of Julian's *Against the Galileans* and claims that it derives from the third book of the emperor's work, but in fact he seems to have taken it from Cyril's third book.[217] Sozomen, for his part, appears to have copied the concluding benediction of Cyril's "Dedication"[218] and reused it for the dedication to Theodosius II that appears at the outset of his own work.[219] Furthermore, at some undetermined point in the fifth century, the author of the *Testimonies against the Jews* (pseudonymously attributed to Gregory of Nyssa) also tacitly drew upon books 1, 3, 8, and 9 of Cyril's *Against Julian*, at times verbatim and at times through paraphrasing summaries.[220]

A few decades after Cyril's death, *Against Julian* was drawn into the debates over his legacy that followed the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The aforementioned *Florilegium Cyrillianum*, a pro-Chalcedonian collection of extracts from Cyril's corpus composed prior to 483, included

[216] For a summary of views, see Kinzig, GCS 20, CLIX n. 553.
[217] Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.23.32–33, quoting *c. Gal.* fr. 17.10–12 Mas., probably based upon *c. Iul.* 3.29.16–18.
[218] *c. Iul.* Dedic.5.13–18. [219] Sozomen, *H.e.* pref.21; cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XI–XII.
[220] Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XII; Boulnois, SC 624, 587–94.

five passages from his apology and was read by Severus of Antioch while he was residing in Constantinople between 508 and 511. To defend his miaphysite cause, Severus composed a twofold reply to the *Florilegium* consisting of his *Philalethes* and *Apology*, in which he corrected and supplemented some of the extracts the original compiler had chosen, showing an impressive eye for detail that in some instances is helpful for establishing the original text.[221] The original *Florilegium* survives in Greek, while Severus' reply exists only in Syriac translation in two sixth-century manuscripts which represent the oldest indirect manuscript witnesses to Cyril's treatise.[222] Severus apparently read *Against Julian* closely because he also cited it in a letter on the obscure matter of a textual variant in Luke 22:43–44.[223] There is, in fact, a possible allusion to Severus' reading of Cyril's apology in his biography written by his contemporary Zacharias of Mytilene. In recounting their student days together in Beirut in the late 480s, Zacharias reports that he and Severus agreed to a plan of supplementing their studies by reading works of various patristic authors, including Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril, and that they "began with writings against the pagans."[224] Although no specific works by Cyril are named, the content of *Against Julian* would certainly have been relevant to the anti-pagan interests of Severus and Zacharias and, if Severus had read the work as a student, this would accord with his later detailed familiarity with the treatise.

Another of Zacharias' works might also reveal awareness of *Against Julian*, namely his fictional dialogue titled *Ammonius*, which claims to represent conversations that took place while he was studying in Alexandria between 485 and 487. Zacharias recounts that Plato's theory of the forms came up for discussion one day as the Neoplatonist philosopher Ammonius was lecturing on Aristotle. To prove to his teacher that Aristotle himself rejected Plato's famous theory, Zacharias quoted *Posterior Analytics* 83a32–33 ("Good riddance to the forms. For they are mere prattle and, even if they do exist, are irrelevant").[225] This passage was rarely cited in antiquity, but one of the few places it does appear is in book 2 of *Against Julian*, where it is similarly deployed with the aim of

[221] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 14.
[222] Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XII–XIV; Chronz and Kinzig 2004, 42–43, 50–51.
[223] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 16.
[224] Zacharias, *Life of Severus* 67–69. Watts incorrectly places this reading program in Alexandria rather than Beirut (Watts 2006, 215).
[225] Zacharias of Mytilene, *Amm.* II, 942–52. We are grateful to Michael Champion for drawing our attention to this passage.

driving a wedge between Plato and his most famous pupil.[226] It is, therefore, plausible that Zacharias drew this argument from Cyril's *Against Julian*, regardless of whether the exchange actually took place in an Alexandrian classroom or was merely created for the fictional dialogue. Furthermore, the emphasis on divine envy one observes in the cosmological arguments of Zacharias and his associate Aeneas of Gaza could be an echo of Cyril's repeated use of this theme in his engagement with Julian on the topic of cosmology in book 2 of *Against Julian*.[227] If these clues suggest that Zacharias and others in his circle were reading *Against Julian*, then this instance of the reception of Cyril's apology conforms to the hypothesis offered above about the origins of the work, specifically that Cyril was inspired to respond to Julian's attack on the faith because it was being used by learned pagans to unsettle the confidence of Alexandrian Christians, and perhaps especially Christian students sitting in religiously diverse classrooms. Cyril's apology was too overtly polemical ever to be taken seriously by a professional philosopher like Ammonius or Hierocles but would have had obvious appeal to their Christian students, since it provided them with an arsenal of counterarguments they could use to rebut the criticisms of Christianity voiced in those settings.

Passages from *Against Julian* were also excerpted and included in a wide range of later florilegia and catena. The *Commentary on Genesis* composed by Zacharias' brother, Procopius of Gaza, who also studied in Alexandria, includes passages from book 10 in paraphrased and abbreviated form, though without explicit acknowledgement of his source.[228] A testimony to an otherwise lost passage from book 16 survives in the catena on Mark compiled by Victor of Antioch,[229] and the catena tradition on Romans and Hebrews also incorporated passages from *Against Julian*, which were erroneously included in Pusey's nineteenth-century edition of the fragments of Cyril's Pauline commentaries;[230] catenists working on Acts and Luke did the same.[231] The fact that books 11 through

[226] Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.45.2–4. The only Greek authors to quote or allude to these lines prior to Cyril are Heraclitus, *All.* 78.4 and Origen, *Cels*. 1.13; 2.12. Cyril elsewhere appears to have known Heraclitus' work, so it could be that he came across the passage there (cf. *c. Iul.* 1.36).

[227] Cf. Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.37.3; 2.38.18; 2.40.16; 2.48.2; Aeneas, *Theophrastus* 49.5–16; Zacharias of Mytilene, *Amm*. II, 111–13; 124; 177; 196; 309; 428; 441; 589; 612; 1099; 1176–85. On the two Gazan texts, see Champion 2014, especially 154–56.

[228] Cf. *c. Iul.* 10.27.20–30.24 = Procopius, *Gen*. 4.2.28–53; *c. Iul.* 10.40.19–33 = Procopius, *Gen.* 15.3.113–18. See Riedweg, GCS 20, XIV–XV.

[229] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 45.

[230] Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.41.27–33; 8.7.16–22; 9.17.11–18; 9.31.1–5; 9.40.8–16; 10.25.1–10; 10.35.36–44.

[231] Cf. *c. Iul.* 9.38; 10.14.11–16.

19 do not survive raises the possibility that still other fragments from the catena tradition, which have been assumed to derive from Cyril's lost biblical commentaries, were in fact also taken from the lost portion of *Against Julian*.

Finally, the monumental florilegium known as the *Sacra*, which was compiled in the seventh century by an otherwise unknown John, contains far more quotations from *Against Julian* than are found in any other single source, including forty-eight extracts from the lost books alone. Three of these were only published for the first time in 2018 and 2019 in the new edition of the *Sacra* that is still in process.[232] As progress on the edition of the *Sacra* continues, still more new fragments might come to light. Moreover, at least based on the portion of the *Sacra* that has thus far been published, it would appear that the compiler drew more passages from *Against Julian* than from all of Cyril's other works combined, a somewhat surprising pattern given that his dogmatic and exegetical works are those for which he has been best-known, both in antiquity and in modern scholarship.[233]

Although we have no trace of a complete translation of *Against Julian* into Syriac, select passages survive in later Syriac sources.[234] A number of still unpublished Syriac florilegia contain extracts from *Against Julian*, and the work is also referenced by George of B'eltan (eighth century), Moses bar Kepha (ninth century), Isho'dad of Merv (ninth century), Dionysius bar Salibi (twelfth century), and Bar Hebraeus (thirteenth century).[235] On occasion we can trace plausible lines of reception. For example, the three fragments of *Against Julian* found in George of B'eltan's *Commentary on Matthew*[236] were probably taken from the lacunose florilegium in the manuscript British Library Add. 17214,[237] while Dionysius bar Salibi in turn used George's commentary as a source for the same three Julianic objections that are reported, without mention of Cyril, in his own commentary on the gospels.[238]

The case of Dionysius bar Salibi illustrates another way Cyril's *Against Julian* was received by later readers – as a source book from which to draw passages belonging to other authors. The testimonies to Julian's *Against the Galileans* found in the Byzantine authors Photius and Arethas

[232] For discussion of the *Sacra*, cf. Kinzig and Brüggemann, GCS 21, 750–54.
[233] See the index in Declerck and Thum 2019, 499–501.
[234] For an overview of Cyril's corpus in Syriac, see Kaufhold 2020.
[235] Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XVI–XVII; Kaufhold, GCS 21, 821–43. See especially the helpfully clear chart noting the portions of *c. Iul.* cited in various Syriac sources in GCS 21, 840–43.
[236] *c. Iul.* frs. 3b; 75; 76. [237] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 3a. [238] Cf. Crawford 2023a.

were probably taken from Cyril's treatise rather than from firsthand acquaintance with Julian's work.[239] Similarly, the learned Italo-Greek monk Philagathos of the twelfth century refers in his homilies to three of Julian's criticisms of the gospels which were almost certainly also taken from Cyril, in light of his use of typically Cyrilline imagery and terminology.[240] And it was not only passages of Julian that were taken up by later authors. Quotations from Pseudo-Sophocles, Pseudo-Orpheus, the Hermetic corpus, and Porphyry were also extracted from *Against Julian* by John Malalas and by the compilers of florilegia in the complex tradition of Byzantine theosophy.[241]

Deriving from the ancient copies of Cyril's *Against Julian*, fourteen manuscripts containing books 1–10 or a portion thereof have survived to the present day, produced between the twelfth or thirteenth and seventeenth centuries, along with excerpts found in still other manuscripts. A thorough description of these witnesses and a proposed stemma may be found in the introduction to the recent GCS edition.[242] Only five contain the entirety of the extant text, with the textual basis for books 6–10 being sparser than for books 1–5. In addition to the surviving Greek manuscripts, we are fortunate to have the aforementioned Latin translation published in Basel by the Reformer Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531), which was based upon the now lost *Codex Capnioneus* (κ). Oecolampadius' Latin translation was sufficiently literal that in many instances it can be used to infer the reading of κ which turns out to play a prominent role in the reconstruction of the text, especially in books 6–10.[243]

The first manuscripts of Cyril's *Against Julian* to reach the West probably arrived in connection with the Council of Ferrara–Florence that began in 1438.[244] The treatise received some attention in the early seventeenth century with the publication of a partial edition,[245] but the *editio princeps* of the entirety of books 1–10 did not appear until 1638 in volume VI of Jean

[239] Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XV–XVI.

[240] *c. Iul.* frs. 72; 73; 74. Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XVII; Kinzig and Brüggemann, GCS 21, 757.

[241] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.44.13–21; 1.46.2–4; 1.46.9–12; 1.46.30–47.2; 1.47.5–9; 1.47.9–16; 1.48.15–23; 1.49.1–7; 1.49.10–17; 1.49.17–20. Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XVIII–XX. Several of these passages also appear in the treatise *De Trinitate* traditionally ascribed to Didymus the Blind, and it is possible, as Riedweg proposes in the GCS apparatus, that some of the later Byzantine authors were drawing these passages from the *De Trinitate* rather than from *Against Julian*.

[242] Riedweg, GCS 20, XXV–LXIII, building upon the earlier study of Riedweg 2000. See also Riedweg 2020a for a description of a newly discovered manuscript witness.

[243] Riedweg, GCS 20, LVIII. Readings from κ are frequently included in the critical apparatus of the GCS edition.

[244] Cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XXV. [245] Cf. Kinzig, GCS 20, LXIV–LXVIII.

Aubert's edition of Cyril's *Opera*,[246] which would serve as the primary basis for all research on Julian's *Against the Galileans* and Cyril's *Against Julian* for nearly four centuries.[247] His text was reprinted in the 1696 edition of Julian's writings produced by Ezekiel Spanheim, which in turn was used for the edition of *Against Julian* that appeared in volume LXXVI of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* in 1859, supplemented by a collection of fragments prepared by Angelo Mai. In 1880 Karl Neumann published the first properly critical edition of Julian's *Against the Galileans*, along with a German translation,[248] extracting Julian's fragments from Spanheim's edition of Cyril's text but also taking into account additional manuscript witnesses and adding Greek and Syriac fragments from other sources.[249] The edition of *Against the Galileans* that Wilmer Cave Wright published in the Loeb Classical Library in 1923 was essentially that of Neumann, and Wright's English translation in the same volume has been the basis for much English-language scholarship on the treatise up to the present day, despite its flaws.[250] William Malley made plans to produce a new edition of *Against Julian* in the mid twentieth century, but these never came to fruition.

The first new partial edition of *Against Julian* since the *editio princeps* finally appeared in 1985, when Paul Burguière and Pierre Évieux published a revised text and French translation of the first two books in the Sources chrétiennes (SC) series, based upon a broader manuscript base than Aubert had used.[251] Five years later Emanuela Masaracchia would release a new edition of the fragments of *Against the Galileans* that would surpass Neumann's, along with an Italian translation and extensive apparatuses. Masaracchia's edition was reprinted with a French translation and an appendix of new fragments in 2018 in a volume by Angelo Giavatto and Robert Muller.[252] But by far the most significant advance in

[246] On Aubert's edition, cf. Kinzig, GCS 20, LXVIII–LXXI; Kinzig and Brüggemann 2006.

[247] For the developments after Aubert, see Kinzig, GCS 20, LXXI–LXXV.

[248] On the translations of *Against the Galileans* and *Against Julian*, see Kinzig, GCS 20, LXXVI–LXXXI.

[249] Neumann 1880a, 1880b. The collection of twenty-seven Syriac fragments in Neumann's edition was prepared by Eberhard Nestle. The Greek fragments of *Against the Galileans* had previously been extracted from Cyril's treatise and published in 1764 by the Marquis d'Argens alongside a French translation that was reissued four years later by Voltaire. Cf. Marcone 2019; Rebenich 2020.

[250] For example, Wright, following Neumann, printed the fragments as a continuously running text, occasionally interrupted by ellipses. A format of separate, numbered fragments is superior since it presumes less about how much text Cyril has preserved for us.

[251] Burguière and Évieux, SC 332.

[252] Masaracchia 1990; Giavatto and Muller 2018. Despite Masaracchia's edition being much superior to the one in Wright's Loeb volume, English-language scholarship still frequently relies upon

scholarship in this area was the publication in 2016–17 of a two-volume edition of *Against Julian* in the renowned series Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (GCS). The culmination of over two decades of meticulous research involving a large team of European scholars, the GCS edition has provided us with a much-improved text, a lengthy introduction, and an overflowing apparatus fontium that will no doubt inspire much further research.[253] A German translation based on the GCS edition was just published, unfortunately too late to be taken into account for the present volume aside from a handful of passages,[254] and Marie-Odile Boulnois has continued the project begun by Burguière and Évieux by publishing two further volumes in the SC series covering books 3–5 and 8–9, which largely reproduce the critical text of the GCS edition alongside a French translation; plans are underway to continue with more volumes in the SC series for the remaining books. A selection of passages from *Against Julian* was published in English in 2000 in an introductory volume to Cyril, but, as noted above, the present book is the first time the entire treatise has been published in the English language.[255]

The Significance of *Against Julian*

Because *Against Julian* has been almost entirely neglected in scholarship until very recently, much work remains to be done to elucidate its significance for the disciplines of patristics, late antique studies, ancient philosophy, and historical theology. We can, nonetheless, gesture towards the general contours of such an account based on our own close reading of the text in the process of translating it, which might also offer entry points for further research. First, as outlined above, *Against Julian* is a veritable treasure trove of other texts, most prominently of course Julian's *Against the Galileans* but also a wide range of other literature. There are few other early Christian texts that engage with such a wide and diverse array of Greek sources, and in such a variety of different modes, from vehement refutation to creative appropriation. In this respect Cyril's

Wright and ignores Masaracchia. Clearly what is needed is a new English translation of *Against Julian*, along with a new edition that takes into account the discoveries that have occurred since Masaracchia published her edition. Cf. Crawford 2023a.

253 The apparatus fontium is aptly described as "eine Art Kommentar *in nuce*" in Riedweg, GCS 20, LXXXIV.

254 Huber-Rebenich, Rebenich, and Schramm 2023; Ritter, Schramm, and Brüggemann 2023.

255 Russell 2000, 190–203, comprising selections from *c. Iul.* 1.1–5; 1.17–18; 1.29–34; 2.34–36; 5.37–38.

massive apology far exceeds the *Apocriticus* of Macarius Magnes and rivals the achievement of Origen's *Against Celsus*, Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, and Augustine's *De civitate Dei*.

Of course, it is also fair to say that Cyril was not as philosophically astute as the earlier Alexandrian, as erudite as his Caesarean predecessor, or as deeply reflective as his contemporary in Hippo. Moreover, those who come to *Against Julian* expecting to find something rigorously rational or deferential to the earlier philosophical tradition are bound to be disappointed. Nevertheless, even if Cyril's mode of argumentation in this text is frequently antagonistic to the ancient philosophical sources upon which he draws, the positions that he defends are not without philosophical and theological interest, such as the idea that all humans share a common nature based upon their creation by a single Maker; the notion that religious devotion develops over time akin to the progress seen in arts like medicine and statue-making; or the claim that all languages exhibit a relative beauty and elegance when considered on their own terms. Moreover, if he was anything, Cyril was a master polemicist skilled at deconstructing what he took to be a fallacious viewpoint and identifying latent tensions or contradictions in his opponent's authoritative texts and conceptual framework. As just one example, his relentless attack upon Plato's *Timaeus* aims to demonstrate that the Craftsman of that dialogue falls short of the Platonic ideal of a nonenvious deity, since he refuses to make humanity immortal. In other words, in this text Cyril is often at his strongest when highlighting the inadequacies of Julian's esteem for the Hellenic tradition than when he is setting forth a carefully worked out rationale for Christian belief.

Against Julian is also significant within Cyril's wider corpus since it is a precious witness to his formation as a thinker. If we did not have the present treatise, we would probably never have known that he read so extensively in Porphyry, the Hermetic writings, and most of the other non-Christian literature he quotes, as well as most of the Christian sources upon which he is dependent, such as Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius. We should not necessarily assume he had read these texts prior to undertaking his refutation of Julian in some earlier stage of his formal education, though that cannot be excluded.[256] What is, nonetheless, evident is that he was doing his own research as he pursued the project, using proximate Christian sources like Pseudo-Justin and Eusebius as prompts to consult other texts. Although previous scholarship on Cyril

[256] Wickham 1983, xv, noted Grant's hypothesis that Cyril tracked down original sources and observed "it looks as if he were making forays into unfamiliar territory."

has investigated the degree to which his thought was shaped by the philosophical tradition,[257] this has mostly been pursued in the absence of engagement with *Against Julian*. Consequently, one task for future research will be to consider whether the influence of the wide reading evident in the present treatise can be traced in his other works and whether it was formative for his theological outlook.

Finally, *Against Julian* is notable as a particularly revealing window into the contest underway in late antiquity between Christianity and traditional religious cult. Of course, both our authors are at pains in this literary debate to construct the boundaries between these two ways of life as starkly and uncompromisingly as possible, and, of course, life "on the ground" for devotees of Christ or, say, Asclepius may have been a much messier and more complex matter. Nevertheless, the virtue of *Against Julian* is that it allows the reader to hear two forceful advocates for these two viewpoints speaking in their own words about what they think is at stake. Cyril has chosen which parts of Julian we are privileged to encounter, but it is still Julian's voice that we meet in these pages, using every bit of rhetorical skill and intellectual power he could muster to convince his Christian subjects to abandon the false religion based on the corpse of a dead Jew and embrace the traditional deities to ensure their own well-being, as well as that of the empire. And in Cyril we witness the bishop of the most intellectually renowned city of the ancient world mining all the texts available to him to find arguments he could deploy to rebut Julian's critique and persuade his readers that Christ-worship deserved the imperial patronage it enjoyed in his day and should continue its forward march, dislodging the daemons from their tyrannical strongholds. Among all the ancient literature that has come down to us, perhaps only Origen's *Against Celsus* showcases such a sustained back-and-forth debate in which two authors advocate in their own words for their religious views, and the status of Cyril as a bishop of the Theodosian age and of Julian as the last pagan emperor lends a greater gravitas to this engagement. Thus, while Cyril's *Against Julian* lacks the grand scope and ambition of Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, as well as the carefully considered structure and smooth eloquence of Theodoret's *Cure for Greek Maladies*, it presents a liveliness of actual debate not found in those contemporary apologetic treatises.

[257] Cf. Siddals 1987; Boulnois 1994, 181–227; van Loon 2009, 61–122; Edwards 2019, 89–92, 134–35.

Principles of Translation

We have used the critical text of the GCS edition as the basis for our translation, though we have also consulted the texts printed in the volumes in the SC series for books 1–5 and 8–9. Departures from the GCS are invariably footnoted where they occur,[258] except for changes to the paragraph breaks in the text (in a number of places we have altered the paragraph breaks to make the stages of Cyril's argument more intelligible for the reader). The only addition to the GCS text that we include here are the three aforementioned new fragments from the *Sacra* that were published for the first time in 2018 and 2019, subsequent to the publication of the GCS edition.[259]

Those familiar with Cyril's Greek will appreciate the difficulty of rendering into intelligible prose his highly idiosyncratic vocabulary and lengthy periods.[260] We have not attempted to capture the former feature in our translation, though we did try to avoid interrupting his periods and succeeded in doing so in most cases.[261] We suspect our translation is, as a result, rather more intelligible to the average reader than the Greek original would have been to its first audience, though our readers probably will not mind, and, in any case, ours is still a translation that

[258] These departures from the GCS text are: *c. Iul.* 1.7.20; 1.41.12; 1.42.4; 1.45.15; 1.47.14–15; 1.47.21; 2.39.9; 3.5.17, 19; 3.5.23; 3.49.28; 3.53.4; 4.36.24; 5.13.8–9; 5.40.14; 8.21.9; 8.21.24; 8.29.14; 9.2.29; 9.14.2–3; 9.16.22; 9.39.21; 10.2.4–5; 10.5.10; 10.9.25; fr. 1.1; fr. 2.1; fr. 14 (p.880.3 Kaufhold); fr .16 (p.881.12 Kaufhold); fr. 26.5–6; fr. 28 (p.883.10 Kaufhold); fr. 34.6; fr. 39 (p.887.22 Kaufhold); fr. 40b (pp.888.24, 888.26 Kaufhold); fr. 56.1; fr. 74.10.

[259] *c. Iul.* frs. 55a; 79; 80.

[260] On Cyril's style, see Vaccari 1937; Riedweg, GCS 20, CLXXV–CLXXXVI; Riedweg highlights how "idiosyncratically, creatively, and innovatively" Cyril used language (CLXXV) and concludes that "no other Greek-speaking author writes like him" (CLXXXV). On this topic Lionel Wickham (1983) memorably remarked, "His literary style, distinctive in its abundance of rare words, archaizing forms and regularly repeated epithets, shows … that he aspired to an elegance at home in the ancient Alexandrine tradition of fine writing. It has, it must be confessed, all the studied ugliness of the Albert Memorial or Second Empire furniture" (xiv). Similarly, Robert Wilken observed, "Cyril's style is prolix and turgid, an unhappy synergy of grandiloquence and affectation; he likes rare and unusual words … and he is achingly repetitious. … The *Contra Iulianum* is not a book one reads for pleasure" (Wilken 1999, 43).

[261] An example of Cyril's dense periodic prose may be seen at *c. Iul.* 6.27.16–30, amounting to just over thirteen lines of text in the Greek, which we have broken into the following three sentences:

> Our response, Your Excellency, would be as follows: We have not deified a human being, as you have supposed, nor do we think it right to worship one who is not God by nature. Rather, we say that the Word himself who has shone forth from God the Father, the one through whom all things were brought into existence, having decided to preserve the human race, became flesh and was incarnate and he came forth as a human being from the holy virgin. Since, after all, his divine and ineffable glory is both unapproachable and in no way bearable, and even more is entirely beyond the reach of our sight, he became

errs on the side of accuracy rather than readability. An attempt was made to bring out in English the many vivid metaphors and analogies that Cyril employed throughout his treatise. We also felt that some important or technical terms warranted providing the Greek in the notes or strict uniformity in their English equivalents, while others received a more diverse range of renderings; we appreciate that many readers will have their own particular interests and questions about the text and might have wished for more (or different) noting. We are convinced that this is a rich and fascinating text that will reward further study.

As to the process we have followed in producing the present volume: Johnson took responsibility for drafting an initial translation of books 3–7 and Crawford took the "Dedication," books 1–2 and 8–10, and the fragments, with each of us then checking the other's work for accuracy and making suggestions for improved readability. Moreover, the entire translation of the Greek text was meticulously checked by Edward Jeremiah, who provided countless suggestions both to improve accuracy and readability, based on extensive comparanda from Cyril's corpus and other ancient Greek sources. So many of Jeremiah's specific suggestions were adopted and so rich was the body of background material he provided that we felt it only right to acknowledge his contribution by listing him as a contributor on the cover and title page of the volume, though Crawford and Johnson retained final judgment over what went into the text and are solely responsible for the notes and introduction. Furthermore, in several instances in book 7, we have adopted the judicious renderings of Margaret M. Mitchell (in a paper originally presented to the North American Patristics Society at our invitation). Crawford's translation of the Syriac fragments was checked for accuracy by Hannah Stork and revised accordingly, and Adam Carter Bremer-McCollum provided a translation for the single (possible) fragment of the treatise that survives in Coptic.[262] Once all of the text had been checked for accuracy twice, Crawford and Johnson subjected it to multiple further rounds of revision for readability and consistency, aided by the careful

> incarnate in order that by living with those on earth for a certain definite period of time in an accommodating manner like one of us, insofar as he was manifest as a human being, he might persuade us to know who is by nature the sole God of the universe, and, in order that, by rendering us experts in every virtue, he might join us to himself through sanctification, destroying every rule, authority and wicked power, and releasing us from the falsely named gods.

[262] *c. Iul.* fr. 78.

eye of Brad Boswell, who performed numerous copy-editing tasks essential for preparing the text for publication and joined us for weekly reading sessions over the span of nearly three years.

We have decided to adopt the format used by Henry Chadwick for his well-known translation of Origen's *Against Celsus* by placing the words of Julian in italics to easily distinguish them from Cyril's prose. Moreover, when Cyril repeats or echoes wording from a passage of Julian in his response to it, we have attempted to italicize these words as well, so that our readers can more easily track his engagement with his opponent's text. And, as noted above, we have continued the practice of inserting the headings "Cyril" and "Julian" into the text, though these do not appear in the manuscripts. In terms of footnotes to the translation, we made no attempt to be comprehensive with listing comparanda, as the GCS apparatus does, and those who wish to study the text closely will want to consult it as well as the notes found in the SC volumes (both the GCS and the SC editions contain a wealth of highly useful information and set a high watermark for scholarship). Where Cyril or Julian is relying on a clear source, it should nonetheless be appropriately indicated in a footnote. We have, moreover, footnoted a more limited range of relevant comparanda, focusing especially on other apologetic literature from the period, such as Origen's *Against Celsus*, Athanasius' *Against the Greeks*, Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, Pseudo-Justin's *Exhortation to the Greeks*, Macarius Magnes' *Apocriticus*, Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, and Theodoret's *Cure for Greek Maladies*. In terms of secondary literature, we have generally limited ourselves to the scholarship we found most useful. However, we hope that our translation serves as a gateway into the recent spate of scholarship on *Against Julian*, most of which has been published in German and French. To that end, we have tried to be as comprehensive as possible in noting relevant literature specific to this treatise published up to the time of sending the book to press.

Finally, to aid ease of reference for readers wanting to consult the original text, we have included the page numbers of the GCS edition in the margins of our text (or in square brackets in the digital version). For the Syriac fragments, we have noted in the heading to each fragment the page numbers both for the German translation (which is printed consecutively along with the Greek of the remaining fragments), as well as the Syriac original (edited by Kaufhold and collected in a separate section of the GCS edition). Where we have added words to the translation that are not in the Greek, we have used square

brackets to indicate our additions only when the addition is perhaps controversial or involves some interpretive judgment; other instances of addition, such as inserting the word "Julian" as the subject of a verb when he is clearly the person in view, have not been marked in any way. Angled brackets (i.e., <>) indicate lacunae or conjectural emendations. Ellipses within square brackets indicate portions of a quotation that have been omitted.

Against Julian

Dedication to the Most Pious and Christ-loving Emperor Theodosius

1 The successes of your holy empire are noteworthy, remarkable, and cannot be expressed in words, and the incomparability of your piety, which is like an inheritance come to you from above, you have successfully defended from the arrows of envy, thanks to the skill in all things excellent that you received from your father and also your grandfather,[1] as is obvious in this instance.[2]

And I am impelled to apply to your own person the words of our Savior, since he says, "A city set upon a hill cannot be hidden."[3] For [4]
elevated things somehow always have the attribute of being conspicuous. And what could possibly match the height of Your Serenity? Certainly nothing, for the fame of your scepters has advanced to the highest sphere, irradiating the universe with the splendor of lawful order, and causing heaven – that is, the rational powers above in heaven – to rejoice at your clemency and devotion to Christ. For you are admired on both accounts, so much so that, possessing an equal virtue in both domains you have surpassed all manner of acclamation.

As a result, the offerings brought by others to you, O Christ-loving Emperor Theodosius, comprise victories, crowns, calls of thanks, and all other means by which people might reasonably honor the mighty deeds of emperors. **2** But as for us whose lot is to offer the divine service, we too were required to bring an offering of our own, in the form of well-composed books in defense of God's glory. For establishing that glory has truly always been the focus of your desire and your habits and your many

[1] The emperors Arcadius (r. 383–408) and Theodosius I (r. 379–95).

[2] For the rhetorical rules governing a "public address" (προσφωνητικὸς λόγος, here translated "dedication," since it is functioning as a preface to a book), see Menander Rhetor, *On Epideictic Speeches* 2.9, 414.31–418.4; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Rhet.* 5, 272–77. Cyril has Christianized the form, focusing on Theodosius' piety rather than his military exploits or civic beneficence, in keeping with the emperor's own imperial propaganda. For an analysis of the political theology Cyril expresses here and elsewhere in his corpus, see Crawford 2025.

[3] Matt 5:14.

[5] prayers: on the one hand, people who drunkenly rage against it in every possible way are regarded by you as utterly detestable and are designated your worst enemies, while, on the other hand, whoever undertakes to think and to speak in a way that promotes the glory of God you deem worthy of every honor.

I would say that this excellence is even saintly and that it is entirely in keeping with the renowned summits that you occupy. For the divine prophet David, singing to Christ, the Savior of all, at one point says, "Did I not hate those who hate you, Lord, and was I not wasting away at your enemies? I hated them with a perfect hatred; they became my enemies."[4] Now this statement is exceptionally appropriate. For just as someone clearly demonstrates their devotion to you by desiring to oppose those who – I do not know how – have chosen out of sheer stupidity not to love you, so too the authenticity of one's love for Christ is made manifest by vigorously contending with people who have slandered what belongs to him, all but crying out and repeating that statement from the God-breathed scripture, "Being zealous, I was zealous for
[6] the Lord."[5]

It is necessary to say what sort of work I am dedicating to you with these words of mine. **3** Forgive me for undertaking to speak not merely against an emperor, but also on behalf of the glory of Christ, the great Emperor who, with his Father, is joint ruler of the universe, the only one who could properly, and indeed necessarily, say, "Through me emperors rule."[6] For he too is "the Lord of glory,"[7] both in heaven and upon the earth. Therefore, it necessarily follows that we who take up arms on behalf of the sacred doctrines and who have, of course, been appointed by him to this task, should oppose those intent on injuring his glory by raising up arguments capable of advocating on his behalf, which might also prove beneficial to readers: for those whose hearts are fickle and very easily snatched and carried off to what is inappropriate it will be a most useful protection, but for those who have a firm footing in the faith it will be a sort of staff able to provide the support needed for them to be still more securely established and to keep the tradition of the orthodox
[7] faith unshaken.

Who then is the one fighting against the glory of Christ? While there have been many who at various times have been dragged down to this level through the devil's perversity, surpassing them all is Julian, who formerly was renowned in the splendor of imperial office, but was

[4] Ps 138 (139):21–22. [5] 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 19:10. [6] Prov 8:15. [7] Cf. 1 Cor 2:8.

ignorant of Christ who bestows the empire and the power to rule. For, before the period of his rule, he was numbered among the believers and was considered worthy even of holy baptism itself and had also been trained in the sacred books. **4** But depraved and superstitious men who became acquainted with him – I do not know how – produced arguments in favor of apostasy. Then, taking up arms with Satan for this purpose, they escorted him to the customs of the Greeks and took this [8]
man who had been trained in the holy churches and monasteries and turned him into a servant of unclean daemons.[8] For "bad company corrupts good morals," as the all-wise Paul said.[9] And so I say that those intent on having a secure mindset and guarding the tradition of the orthodox faith like a pearl[10] must not let people intent on practicing superstition sneak into their mind or allow them to speak freely. For it is written, "With the holy you will be holy, with the innocent man you will be innocent, with the chosen one you will be chosen, and with the crooked you will pervert."[11]

Therefore, having a clever tongue, His Excellency Julian sharpened it against Christ, the Savior of us all, and composed three books[12] against the holy gospels and against the pure worship of Christians, with which he is rattling many people and causing no small amount of injury. For

[8] For Cyril's references to Julian's apostasy, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.10.17–22; 5.23.1–6; 6.8.43–50; 10.13.24–28. The nature of Julian's shift in religious views from Christianity to traditional Greco-Roman piety continues to be debated in scholarship. Cf. Elm 2012, 92 n. 17, 368–71. At *Ep.* III (p.191.1–3 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 47 [pp.148–49 Wright]) Julian refers to a decisive change in his religious views at the age of twenty, though at *in reg. Sol.* 1.130b–131a he narrates a continuity between his childhood piety and adult devotion to Helios. He might also be alluding to this change of religious perspective in the opening sentence of *Against the Galileans* when he says he has been "persuaded" that Christianity is false (*c. Gal.* fr. 1.2 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.2.27]). Furthermore, it is tempting to regard as autobiographical his later claim that anyone with a "noble character" or "even a small fraction of natural talent … quickly became apostate from your [Christian] atheism" (*c. Gal.* fr. 55.8–9 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 7.16.21–23]). His conversion to paganism is also mentioned in Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.1; Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.1–2; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 4.52; Libanius, *Or.* 12.33–34; 13.11–12; 18.18–19. Cyril does not identify the "depraved and superstitious men" who led Julian astray; but see the description of the influence exerted upon him by Maximus of Ephesus at Julian, *c. Her.* 23.235ac; Eunapius, *VS* 7.5–52 Goulet; Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.1.16–18; Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.2.16. Aside from allusive aspersions against Julian, the brief account above is the only reference in the surviving portions of *c. Iul.* to any information about Julian or his reign beyond what Cyril would have read in *c. Gal.*, and it is too vague to identify what source he was drawing upon. He seems to be the only ancient author to claim that Julian was trained in a monastery, though both Socrates Scholasticus (*H.e.* 3.1.19) and Sozomen (*H.e.* 5.2.17) say that for a time Julian pretended to live like a monk in order to conceal his conversion from Constantius.

[9] 1 Cor 15:33, a maxim that goes back to Euripides, *fr.* 1024.

[10] Cf. Matt 13:45–46.

[11] Ps 17(18):26–27.

[12] This is the only reference in ancient or medieval literature to Julian's treatise consisting of three books, and even here the crucial word τρία ("three") is lacking in several significant mss (FME). For further discussion, see the Introduction to this volume.

[9] fickle and credulous persons are easily falling into his arguments and are becoming fresh prey for the daemons. And occasionally somehow even those who are firm in the faith are being thrown into confusion. For they suppose that he knew the sacred and divine scriptures since he heaps up numerous testimonies from them for his own arguments, despite the fact that he actually had no idea what he was talking about.[13]

5 Moreover, since many of those superstitious persons, when they encounter those who have Christ's mindset, are ridiculing them from top to bottom, bringing forward Julian's treatise against us and claiming that it contains an invincible cleverness and that none of our teachers has ever been able to refute or to overthrow his arguments,[14] and with many people urging me on to this task, I take heart in the God who says, "And now go, and I will open your mouth,"[15] and have entered the arena, taking on my duty of pulling down the Greek eyebrow raised against the glory of Christ, and, as far as I am able, coming to the aid of those who
[10] have been deceived, by showing that the accuser of Christ, the Savior of us all, has been misled and does not know the divine scriptures.

Now I dedicate my words on this subject to your Christ-loving and most holy Highness. May God always protect you in unwavering tranquility, as you overwhelm your enemies and place them all under your feet, and pass on your holy empire to your children's children, with Christ nodding in assent, through whom and with whom be glory to God the Father with the Holy Spirit unto eternity. Amen.[16]

[13] In Libanius' brief description of Julian's *c. Gal.*, he too highlighted critique of the Christian scriptures as the central aim of the work (*Or.* 18.178). Cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.22.10–3.23.8.

[14] Later sources also state that Cyril was prompted to write *c. Iul.* as a result of the esteem with which Julian's *c. Gal.* was held by contemporary non-Christians in Alexandria. Cf. *Hist.copt.eccl. Alex.* II, pp.77–79 Orlandi; Severus Ibn al Muqaffa', *Hist.patriarch.* 1.12 (PO 1.431–32 Evetts).

[15] Exod 4:12.

[16] The final paragraph (*c. Iul.* Dedic.5.13–18) is identical to the one that appears at the conclusion of the address to Theodosius II that prefaces Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History* (*H.e.* pref.21), with only a few minor changes. Because it contains characteristically Cyrillian language (e.g., the phrase ἀκλονήτοις εὐθυμίαις and the verb κατευμεγεθοῦσαν), it seems that Sozomen copied the benediction from *c. Iul.* to use in his own work. The phrase "your Christ-loving Highness" was also used of Theodosius II by the bishops gathered at the Council of Ephesus in 431 (cf. Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum [ACO] 1.1.3, p.65.11; 1.1.5, p.14.24).

Book 1

1.1 Those wise and sagacious experts in the sacred doctrines marvel at [11]
the beauty of the truth and highly regard the ability to understand "a parable and an obscure word, both the sayings of the wise and their obscure utterances."[1] For by thus focusing their exact and discerning mind on the God-breathed writings, they fill up their souls with the divine light, and by setting their ambition upon achieving an upright and most lawful way of life, they may also become providers to others of the [12]
highest assistance.[2] For it is written, "Son, if you should become wise for yourself, you will be wise also for your neighbor."[3]

But those people who have a perverted heart and a crippled mind, with no share at all in the divine light, rise up against the doctrines of piety and, with exceedingly arrogant tongues, disparage the ineffable glory, and, spewing out insulting words, "they speak injustice up to the height" as sung by David in *Psalms*.[4] I believe that they acquired this sickness due to the extreme madness and ignorance inherent in them, or rather, to be honest, as a result of a plot of that wicked dragon who is the source of all evil, I mean Satan.[5]

1.2 And we find additional confirmation of this in the marvelous Paul, who wrote, "Even if our gospel has been concealed, it has been concealed among those who are being destroyed, among whom the god of this age [13]
has blinded the minds of unbelievers to prevent them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ."[6] Indeed, it is not hard to see that the one deemed to be "god of this age" and the plunderer of the

[1] Prov 1:6.

[2] On the theme of benefiting others, see *c. Iul.* 9.36. The fact that Cyril begins his treatise by highlighting the importance of being able to interpret sacred texts points to the central place of biblical exegesis in Julian's polemic in *c. Gal.*, as Libanius also mentioned (*Or.* 18.178). Moreover, it aligns with Cyril's own activities as a bishop, since his surviving corpus largely consists of lengthy biblical commentaries.

[3] Prov 9:12. [4] Ps 72(73):8. [5] Cf. Cyril's description of Julian's apostasy in *c. Iul.* Dedic.4.

[6] 2 Cor 4:3–4.

glory above has darkened their hearts.[7] For they have undeniably been led astray and they set up over life too many gods to count, both daemons and souls of heroes, as they themselves say and are bent on thinking.

However, the wise shed few tears for those people who choose to keep quiet about things that someone might be ashamed of, and reasonably so.[8] But now this undertaking of theirs is proceeding so far into impiety that they are also seeking to implant into others the sickness of so shameful a superstition. For they are like a group of serpents lying in
[14] ambush at an intersection, who cruelly rush upon passers-by, injecting the poison of perdition into people who are easily led astray. And about them it might be said, and appropriately so, "Serpents, brood of vipers, how can you speak good things when you are evil?"[9] And the Lord would not have been far from the truth when he said, "The good person brings forth good things out of the good treasure of his heart, and the evil person brings forth evil things out of the evil treasure of his heart";[10] and, "from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks."[11]

1.3 I say this after having read the books of Julian, who brought an intolerable accusation against our pure worship, claiming that we have been deceived and have foolishly departed from the straight and blame-
[15] less path, and that we are going onto the rocks and render to the God over all a worship that is utterly unwanted by him, since it accords neither with the laws that came through the all-wise Moses, nor with the superstitions of the Greeks – that is, their customs and habits – but instead have invented a kind of intermediate way of life that misses them both.[12]

Now as for my own view, I would say that we have escaped from the Greek stupidity and that a long list of differences separates Christianity[13] from their sophistry. For there is no "fellowship of the light with the darkness," nor is there any "sharing of the believer with the unbeliever."[14] And, moreover, when it is the right occasion to exercise our reason on

[7] Cf. Rom 1:21.

[8] The above sentence perhaps echoes an imperial edict dated to June 8, 423 that commanded Christians not to engage in violence towards Jews and pagans who "were living quietly" and not disrupting social order (*CTh*. 16.10.24).

[9] Matt 12:34; 23:33.

[10] Matt 12:35 = Luke 6:45a. Cyril's citation of this verse includes the additional phrase "of his heart," repeated twice. Clement of Alexandria also included this variant reading in his citation of the passage at *Q.d.s.* 17.2.

[11] Matt 12:34b = Luke 6:45b.

[12] Cyril is here summarizing and echoing language from several passages of Julian. Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 3; 47; 48; 58; 72 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9; 6.25; 6.31; 7.28; 9.22).

[13] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [14] 2 Cor 6:14–15.

these topics I will try to demonstrate, as far as I can, that in fact we are not at odds with the books of Moses nor do we practice a way of life in opposition to his oracles.[15]

1.4 But for the moment, I should think we only need say the following. It is true, as the proverb coined by someone goes, that "One is wise from another."[16] Moreover, it surely should be obvious to everyone that the teaching of the ancients is known by those who came after them, rather than the teaching of those later people being known by their predecessors. Therefore, since the children of the Greeks[17] think highly of [16] their own teachers and suppose they can frighten some people by name-dropping for our benefit the Anaximanders, Empedocleses, Protagorases, and Platos of the world,[18] and adding to this list others who were the inventors of their unholy teachings and were, if I can put it this way, founts of ignorance, come now and let us say that one can see them rising up as though opposing one another with diverse views and bringing forward a defense that is irreconcilable with any aspect of reality.[19] Then, in addition to this, let us demonstrate that Moses takes the honors for chronological precedence; that he introduced the most unerring and correct view concerning the ineffable and supreme substance; that he has memorialized the best account of the creation of the world; and that he was a remarkable judge who issued laws that lead to piety and justice. Furthermore, let us demonstrate that their so-called "wise men" were born later, being in fact much more recent; that they have stolen what belonged to Moses and woven it together with their own words; and that, even if they haven't done so altogether soundly, they were thus in the end able to seize upon this respectable view and [17] give the impression of speaking something true.

[15] See especially *c. Iul.* 9.13–47.

[16] Attributed to the lyric poet Bacchylides, *Pae.* fr. 5.1; previously cited by Clement, *Str.* 5.68.5.

[17] Gk.: Ἑλλήνων παῖδες. The mention of "teachers" in this sentence suggests that "children" refers metaphorically to "disciples" or "students." The phrase οἱ Ἑλλήνων παῖδες became common in Christian literature from the fourth century onwards. Cf., e.g., Eusebius, *D.e.* 1.1.12; 3.6.22; 10.8.92; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 29.2; Epiphanius, *Anc.* 86.6; Didymus (?), *Trin.* 3.4 (PG 39.833a). Cyril will use it again at *c. Iul.* 1.37.16–17; 7.19.13–14; 8.50.2–3; 10.27.28. See also the similar use of παῖδες to refer to medical students at *c. Iul.* 8.51.5.

[18] Note Cyril's pluralizing of these names, no doubt a mark of contempt, as suggested by Runia 2023, 214. Runia proposes that Cyril has drawn the names from the epitomized version of Aetius' *Placita* attributed to Plutarch, a source he will cite explicitly at *c. Iul.* 2.14–15; 2.22; 2.52. See also *c. Iul.* 1.38–39. Gregory of Nazianzus similarly uses plurals in his first oration against Julian, dismissing the emperor's education at the hands of "Platos, Chrysippuses," and others (*Or.* 4.43). For a similar use of the plural, see Plutarch, *De soll. an.* 962B, referring to "Socrateses and Platos."

[19] Disagreement among philosophers is also adduced to undermine their authority at Eusebius, *P.e.* 14–15; Augustine, *C. D.* 18.41. See Johnson 2021, 452.

1.5 Accordingly, while certain people were born just after Moses, still others flourished later in the days of the holy prophets who came after him. Some of them chose to follow his views and so deserve a better verdict than the rest, despite the fact that they give an explanation of their view of God that is not altogether free from falsehood.

Therefore, by scrutinizing the books written accurately by the chroniclers, we aim to establish clearly that the divinely inspired Moses was older – I mean according to the date of his birth – and that those others came after him, much later in time.[20] And I should add that prospective readers must not have a dainty appetite when reading the list of names and calculation of dates, but should have an intense thirst for full confidence on each point, which is good and beneficial.

1.6 So then, Noah, a man who was especially beloved by God, was in the tenth generation from the first man, that is, Adam.[21] Since there was about to be a flood that would bring utter destruction upon all those who lived upon the earth, the God of the universe commanded this man to construct an ark and to go into it together with his closest relatives and their wives and all kinds of animals, including both those that fly
[18] and those that walk upon the ground, and to sail through the flood in this ark. And once it was all over, the entire human race, along with all other living creatures, perished, but he and his household were saved. When the waters had subsided, the ark landed at the mountains of Ararat, that is, in Armenia.[22] And once Noah had again set foot on the ground, he offered sacrifices of thanksgiving.

[20] Although Cyril does not name the "chroniclers" he is following, the subsequent section, at *c. Iul.* 1.6–17, is heavily dependent upon Eusebius of Caesarea, specifically his two-part, highly influential *Chronicon*. Book 1 of Eusebius' *Chronicon* consisted of a lengthy discussion of the various historical sources he used to compile the extensive and detailed synchronized timelines that comprised the second half of the work. Book 2 thus used the birth of Abraham as a starting point and counted forward to the fourth century AD, recording the regnal years of the rulers of a variety of nations and including miscellaneous historical notes scattered throughout at the appropriate chronological points. Note, however, that around the year 400 two Alexandrian monks, named Panodorus and Annianus, produced a revised version of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, and it is possible that Cyril was relying upon their rendition. Augustine also extensively drew upon Jerome's Latin translation and continuation of Eusebius' work in *De civitate Dei* book 18. For an analysis of Augustine and Cyril's dependence on Eusebius, see Crawford 2020b and, for a study of Cyril's argument in this section, see Rebenich 2021. The claim that Christian truth was more ancient than Greek wisdom was a staple of apologetic literature. See, e.g., Justin, *1 Apol.* 23.1; Tatian, *Or.* 31–41; Clement, *Str.* 1.21.101–47; Origen, *Cels.* 1.16; 4.11; 4.36; 6.43; 7.28; Eusebius, *P.e.* 10; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 14.2; Theodoret, *Affect.* 1.50–52. On this theme, see Droge 1989; Pilhofer 1990.

[21] For what follows, cf. Gen 6–8.

[22] The account of Noah's flood in *Genesis* mentions the "mountains of Ararat" (Gen 8:4) but does not identify the site with Armenia, though this connection is found in Eusebius, *Onomast.* 1 Timm; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 2.1 Holl.

Now, the God-breathed scripture is sufficient for faith, but since some of those superstitious people assert that our books[23] are mere pointless myths that have no persuasive force or truth at all, I will have to mention some of their own historians as well. I have in mind Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus. For they too have provided a narrative of these events in their own writings, though it is not entirely free from error and is somewhat strange, inasmuch as they did not have the benefit of the doctrines that lead to piety.

1.7 Alexander says the following: "When Otiartus died, his son Xisuthrus reigned for eighteen *saroi*[24] and it was in his reign, they say, that the great flood occurred."[25] Then he says that Xisuthrus was saved when Cronus told him beforehand what was about to happen and said [19] that it behoved him to build an ark[26] for himself and to sail in it together with birds and beasts and domesticated animals.[27]

Furthermore, Abydenus provides a clearer account when he says,

> After him, others ruled, including Xisuthrus. Cronus told him in advance that there would be a huge amount of rain on the fifteenth of the month of Daisios, and he ordered him to hide at Heliopolis of Sippar any documents in his possession. Once Xisuthrus had fully accomplished this, he set sail to go straight to Armenia and immediately the events foretold by the god overtook him. And on the third day when the rain abated, he released birds as a test to see if they could find any land that had emerged from the water. But with nothing but the wide-open sea waiting for them, the birds did not know where they should land and so returned back to Xisuthrus. Another release of birds had the same outcome, but when the third attempt was a success – for they returned with their feet covered in mud – the gods removed Xisuthrus from humankind. And the boat stayed in Armenia and[28] supplied the people of that country with wooden [20] amulets possessed of healing properties.[29]

[23] Gk.: τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν.

[24] A σάρος was a Babylonian measure of time based on the cycle of lunar eclipses. It is roughly equivalent to eighteen years.

[25] Alexander Polyhistor, FGrHist 273 F 79. Cyril took this passage of Alexander Polyhistor (an historian and ethnographer of the first century BC) from Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.10.19–20 Karst.

[26] Gk.: λάρνακα, a different term from the one used in the biblical account (κιβωτός), though the two words have similar semantic ranges, meaning a box, chest, or even coffin.

[27] Cf. Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.10.22–33 Karst.

[28] We here follow an emendation to the text included in Burguière and Évieux, SC 322, 122. The GCS edition has ἤ, καὶ after "wooden amulets possessed of healing properties" which results in an obscure syntax. Burguière and Évieux, based on a comparison with this passage as it was transmitted in the Armenian edition of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, change the ἤ to ἣν and relocate the phrase to follow "in Armenia."

[29] Abydenus, FGrHist 685 F 3. Cyril took this passage of Abydenus (an historian of the second century BC [?]) from Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.16.12–29 Karst, though it was also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.12.1–5.

1.8 Thus these two historians call Noah "Xisuthrus," possibly because this is how he is known in the language of the Assyrians, but even here they have again fallen short of the truth when they say that "Cronus" delivered this oracle to him instead of saying the God over all did so. This, however, is not surprising given that they had no share in the divine light nor indeed had they beheld the venerable beauty of the truth with the eyes of the mind.

So Noah performed sacrifices when he went forth from the ark, and he camped on that spot with his relatives. And there were born to him three sons, and indeed from them came many others and so they became a second beginning of humanity on earth. And at first they lived in close proximity, only in the east, but then they were scattered in all directions when the God over all divided them into a variety of languages. For he had become indignant at their building of a tower. And we will realize no less from their own writings that those persons we just named also have a
[21] record of this story.

1.9 For this is what Alexander says:

> Now the Sibyl says that when all humanity spoke the same language, some of them built a tower of enormous size so that they could go up into heaven, but when God blew winds against the tower he overturned it and gave to each person a distinct language. And this is why the city was called Babylon.[30]

And again Abydenus:

> Here they say those who emerged first, puffed up with conceit by their strength and stature, and, imagining that they were, in fact, far greater than the gods, raised up a gigantic tower in the place where Babylon stands today. And as they were drawing near to heaven, the winds came to the aid of the gods and caused the fabricated structure to collapse around them. The ruins came to be called Babylon. And although up to this point they spoke the same language, they then received from the gods confused speech.[31]

1.10 Next, once Noah's descendants had been scattered and time galloped on, Ninus, the son of Arbelus, is said to have been the first

[30] Alexander Polyhistor, FGrHist 273 F 79. Cyril has taken this passage from Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.12.10–14 Karst, though it is also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.15.1. The mention of the Sibyl is a reference to *Sibylline Oracles* 3.97–107 Geffcken, which was also quoted in Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2.31; Josephus, *AJ* 1.118.

[31] Abydenus, FGrHist 685 F 4. Cyril has taken this passage from Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.17.12–21 Karst, though it is also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.14.2.

notable ruler of the Assyrians.[32] The city of Nineveh is said to be named after him, and its magnificent walls were made by Semiramis who was married to Ninus. [22]

Now they say it was when Ninus was administering the kingdom of the Assyrians and Europs the kingdom of the Sicyonians that blessed Abraham is said to have been born. He was an extremely wise man with wide learning, and was eager to categorize among the most serious of pursuits the duty of knowing the truth and the identity of the Craftsman and Lord of all. For he rejected and pushed far away the views of the Assyrians – I mean those pertaining to the polytheistic error – and was welcomed by God because he supposed that knowing the truth would be enough to bring complete well-being. For he heard, "Go out from your land and from your family and from the house of your father, and go into the land that I will show to you."[33] [23]

As for the manner of life that he and his descendants lived, I will set aside speaking about that for now, since time forces us to turn the discussion to other matters. And skipping the intervening generations, on account of the great number of events and names involved, I will come swiftly to the hierophant Moses himself.

1.11 For after 425 years had passed since the divine Abraham lived, Moses was born in Egypt while Abraham's descendants were sojourning there. And when he was still young and had encountered the wisdom of the Egyptians, he came to regard such human concerns as a sort of warm-up exercise[34] for more divine studies. Having traced, then, the time from Abraham to Moses, let us take the latter as a second chronological starting point and count forward from Moses' birth. [24]

They say that in Moses' seventh year Prometheus, Epimetheus, and Atlas (Prometheus' brother) were born, along with the all-seeing Argos. During Moses' thirty-fifth year, Cecrops, who was nicknamed "two natures," became the first king in Athens. They say that he was the first person to sacrifice an ox and to name "the highest of the gods" among the Greeks (to use their expression) Zeus. They say that it was in Moses' sixty-seventh year that Deucalion's flood occurred in Thessaly, the same time that Phaethon, who the Greeks claim was the son of Helios, was

[32] Starting here and going to *c. Iul.* 1.16, Cyril includes selected material from the events and persons listed in the chronological tables comprising the second book of Eusebius' *Chronicon*. Precise references for all of the passages he draws upon can be found in the apparatus of the GCS edition.

[33] Gen 12:1.

[34] Gk.: προγύμνασμα. Cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 18.37. Cyril will use the metaphor again at *c. Iul.* 7.23.12–14.

burned up in Ethiopia. In the seventy-fourth year of Moses, Hellen, the so-called son of Deucalion and Pyrrha, gave the Hellenes their name,
[25] although they were formerly called "Greeks."[35]

1.12 In Moses' 120th year, Dardanus founded the city called Dardania, while Amyntas reigned over the Assyrians, Sthenelus over the Argives, and Ramses over the Egyptians. And Ramses was also called Aegyptus and was himself the brother of Danaus. In the 160th year after Moses, Cadmus ruled over Thebes, and his daughter was Semele, who gave birth to Dionysus by Zeus, as the Greeks say. Now it was also at that time that the musicians Linus of Thebes and Amphion lived. And at that time Phineas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, succeeded to the priesthood among
[26] the Hebrews, after Aaron had died of course.

They say that the rape of Kore by Hades, king of Molossus, which is sung about among the Greeks, took place in the 195th year after Moses. Hades is said to have kept an immense dog named Cerberus that he let loose upon Peirithous and Theseus when they came to take away his wife. They say that then, when Peirithous had been destroyed, Heracles, who happened to be present, rescued Theseus, and this is why they tell the myth that he escaped from Hades.

In the 290th year, Perseus killed Dionysus, whose tomb they say is in Delphi, next to the golden Apollo. In the 355th year after Moses, Priam
[27] ruled after Laomedon. Four hundred and ten years after Moses, Troy was sacked when Heshbon was leading the Hebrews, Agamemnon the Argives, Hophra the Egyptians, and Tautanus the Assyrians.

1.13 Hence, we can conclude that 410 years passed from the birth of Moses until the fall of Troy. And now consider for me again those people who came next. For I will run through them rapidly, not dwelling on the intervening generations, but rather anchoring our account only to the essential persons.

So, in the fifth year after the fall of Troy, Aeneas ruled over the Latins and Demophon, son of Theseus, over the Athenians, while Samson was judge among the Hebrews. Sixty-five years after the fall of Troy, the priest Eli died, as it is written in the first book of the *Kings*, and foreigners
[28] carried away the ark into their own land,[36] at the time when the blessed Samuel, who would eventually anoint Saul as king, was serving as a prophet. They say that Homer and Hesiod were born 165 years after the

[35] Throughout this treatise Cyril uses the word Ἕλλην to refer to his contemporaries, which we typically translate as "Greek." Here, however, he refers to their alternate designation as Γραϊκοί, which he regards as an older name that was replaced by Ἕλλην, so we have translated Ἕλλην in this instance as "Hellene" to maintain the distinction.

[36] Cf. 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 4:18; 5:1.

fall of Troy, when Labotas was ruling over the Lacedaemonians, Laosthenes over the Assyrians, Alba Silvius over the Latins, and Agelaus over the Corinthians. Two hundred and sixty-eight years after the fall of Troy, Elijah and Elisha were serving as prophets, while Joram administered the kingdom of the Hebrews and Archelaus the kingdom of the Lacedaemonians. Three hundred and sixty-five years after the fall of Troy, Lycurgus was making laws for the Lacedaemonians while Agemon was ruling over the Corinthians and Procas Silvius over the Latins. Three hundred and eighty years after the fall of Troy, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, and Jonah were serving as prophets. And some[37] say that Hesiod was not a contemporary of Homer but was born at the time that Azariah, who was [29] also called Uzziah, was administering the affairs of the Hebrews, Arbaces those of the Medes, and Procas Silvius those of the Latins.

1.14 Hence, we can conclude that there were 405 years from the fall of Troy to the first Olympiad, and 815 years from the birth of Moses until the same point, the first Olympiad.

In the first Olympiad, the epic poet Arctinus of Miletus is said to have been born, and Romus[38] and Romulus were born when Joatham was ruling over Judea and Pekah over Israel. They say that in the ninth Olympiad the epic poet Eumelus and the Erythraean Sibyl were born. They say that in the seventeenth Olympiad the Sibyl, whom they also called Herophila, was born. They say that in the twenty-third Olympiad Archilocus was born, [30] while Manasseh was exercising rule over the Jews. They say that in the twenty-ninth Olympiad Hipponax, Simonides, and the musician Aristoxenus were renowned. It is said that in the thirty-fifth Olympiad Thales of Miletus, the son of Examyes and the first natural philosopher, was born, and they say that his life extended until the fifty-eighth Olympiad. In the thirty-sixth Olympiad, the divine Jeremiah was serving as a prophet in Judea, as was also Zephaniah. In the forty-second Olympiad Alcmaeon and Pittacus, who was from Mytilene and was one of the seven sages, were renowned, as too was Stesichorus the poet. And it was at this same time that the blessed Daniel and his companions were born. [31]

1.15 In the forty-sixth Olympiad Solon issued laws abrogating Draco's laws except for those concerning homicide.[39] In the forty-ninth Olympiad, while the Jews were in Babylon or in the mountains of the Persians and

[37] Cyril has in mind Porphyry, based on a comment in Eusebius' *Chronicon*. Cf. Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 1, fr. 202 Smith.

[38] Romus is a not uncommon spelling for Remus in Greek authors of the imperial period; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.14.4.

[39] Cf. *c. Iul.* 5.25.20–23 with note.

Medes (for they had become captives), Daniel and Ezekiel were serving as prophets among them. In the fiftieth Olympiad the seven sages and the natural philosopher Anaximander of Miletus were renowned. In the fifty-sixth Olympiad, when Cyrus was exercising rule over the Persians, Haggai and Zechariah were prophesying, while Simonides and Chilon, who belong to the seven sages, were already distinguished.[40] In the fifty-eighth
[32] Olympiad, Theognis became famous as a poet. In the fifty-ninth Olympiad, Ibycus the lyric poet and Pherecydes the historian, along with the tragic poets Phocylides and Xenophanes, were born. In the sixty-second Olympiad, Pythagoras is said to have been born. In the seventieth Olympiad, they say that the natural philosophers Democritus and Anaxagoras were born, together with Heraclitus who was nicknamed "the obscure." In the seventy-fourth Olympiad Phrynicus and Choerilus and the natural philosophers <around> Diagoras [flourished].[41] They say that in the eighty-sixth Olympiad Democritus of Abdera was born, along with
[33] Empedocles, Hippocrates, Prodicus, Zeno, and Parmenides. They say that in the eighty-eighth Olympiad the comic poets Aristophanes and Eupolis were born, as was also Plato. They say that in the 103rd Olympiad Aristotle, at a very young age, listened to Plato's lectures. They say that in the 112th Olympiad Alexandria in Egypt was founded in the seventh year of Alexander's reign. And at that same time the philosophers Anaximenes and Epicurus were born.

1.16 They say that in the 124th Olympiad, while Ptolemy Philadelphus was ruling in Egypt, Serapis came to Alexandria from Sinope, and he was
[34] the same as Pluto.[42] For this reason, a temple was founded for the statue that the Egyptians, in the local language, call Rhacotis, by which they mean nothing other than Pluto. This is the same reason why they built the shrine near the tombs. Now the Greeks have a dispute among themselves about the account of Serapis. For some do not think he is Pluto,

[40] Cyril seems to have made a mistake here, since Simonides was not said by Eusebius to have been one of the seven sages.

[41] None of the mss have "around Diagoras" but simply "Diagoras," with the result that Phrynicus, Choerilus, and Diagoras are all classified here as "natural philosophers." This, however, would be a mistake, since the former two were poets, not philosophers. Hence the editors of the GCS edition have emended the text to read "those around Diagoras" based upon George Syncellus' *Chronicle*, which also drew from Eusebius.

[42] For what follows on Serapis, Cyril is dependent on Clement, *Protr.* 4.48.2–6, who mentioned several traditions about the origin of this cult. The notion that the name was derived from "Osirapis" was attributed to the Stoic philosopher Athenodorus of Tarsus. Note that this is the only bit of information Cyril added to the chronological material he took over from Eusebius' *Chronicon* in this section. In his recounting of past events leading up to the time of Christ, Augustine too lingered upon the origins of Serapis' cult and his name (*C. D.* 18.5).

but rather Osiris, and others say Apis. Hence, since there was much wrangling over this matter – so they say – they erected the statue after settling, as if by unanimous agreement, on the unified expression "Osirapis," so that both Osiris and Apis could be understood in the same term. And accounts of the death and burial of them both are in circulation. But, over time, the persistent habit of omitting the letters "Osi" caused the image to be named Serapis.

Now this Ptolemy, who became one of the most learned people, sent one of his close friends to Judea, carrying a letter to Eleazar who was at that time the priest according to the law. He asked Eleazar to send him all the books of Moses and of the holy prophets, since he was eager to learn from them, and along with them also to send forth persons capable of translating them into the Greek language. And so it was done.[43]

In the 194th Olympiad, when Augustus Caesar was ruling over the Romans, our Lord Jesus Christ was begotten according to the flesh. [35]

1.17 Hence, from the exact record of the times and indeed the generations, how is it not clear to everyone that the divine Moses was older than all the Greek wise men, who instead are youths, almost as if they had only just shown up? For they were not even born until long after the list of the Olympiads had begun.

On this basis, it is, I think, rather easy to see, and would be correct to say, that they did not entirely miss out on Moses' doctrines nor was it as though they had never heard of the God-given and unadulterated wisdom abiding in him. As a result, from time to time they happen to mutter the truth imperfectly, entwining it with falsehood and mingling the sweetest perfume with filth.

For is there any wise teaching worth grasping that isn't contained in the Mosaic books? And how could anyone not admire his ideas? For those who are well-versed in the finer points of the Greeks' academic pedantry say that philosophy is divided into contemplative knowledge and practical knowledge, and that, if a person is skilled in both, he goes on to be regarded as someone who successfully practices philosophy.[44] [36]

[43] Cyril refers to the legend of the translation of the LXX, which he took to be identical to the Greek version of the Hebrew scriptures he himself used. He will refer to the translation of the LXX again at *c. Iul.* 7.20.5–7.

[44] This distinction goes back to Aristotle, *EN* 10.7. It is attributed to Aristotle, Theophrastus, and the Peripatetics in Aetius, *Plac.* 1.Proem.3 and became a commonplace in late antiquity. See, e.g., Diogenes Laertius 7.92; Philo, *Leg.* 1.57; Alcinous, *Didasc.* 34.5; Clement, *Paed.* 1.3.9.4; Origen, *Jo.* 1.91–94; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 4.113; Didymus, *Zach.* 1.266; Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1219; Augustine, *C. D.* 8.4. Cyril refers to this division also at *c. Iul.* 2.6.6–7 (cf. our note *ad loc.*); 2.12.10–12; and *Mich.* 7:14–15 (1.732–33 Pusey), on which see Crawford 2014, 211–15.

Well then, observe that Moses was just this kind of person. For he theologizes unlike anyone else about the substance above all substances and its incomparable glory and preeminence over all things, and he shows that the one and only God is the Lord and generator of the universe. And if you place a high value on the good and are passionate about the good life, you will see him ordaining exceptional laws that surpass all others and enable people to become especially revered.

1.18 But perhaps someone will say, "Alright, so Moses' books[45] are older even than the Greeks' wise men. Still, it is not true to say that they can be convicted of stealing or appropriating the wisdom that was in him."

In that case, if our argument seems quite implausible, then let our eager listeners put it to the test. The Greeks' historians traveled over practically the entire earth in their constant desire to learn something, in order that they might seem learned. For they considered it a crowning feature of their own writing not to pass over in silence any past event. How, then, could people who were so accustomed to seeking out knowledge have neglected the necessary task of investigating such a venerable [37] history and such an exact explanation of the most time-honored doctrines and laws?

In fact, Pythagoras of Samos and Thales the Milesian spent no small amount of time in Egypt gathering together Egyptian sources and, it is said, making a collection of their teachings, before bringing these back to their own country.[46] And, indeed, Plato himself, the son of Ariston, also says in the *Timaeus* that Solon the Athenian went to Egypt and heard one of the false prophets, or rather priests, there saying, "O Solon, Solon, you Greeks are always children, and there is no such thing as a Greek old man; […] you are all youths at heart. For you have among you not a single ancient view or any teaching that has grown old with time; […] but this has escaped your notice because over the course of many generations people died without being able to express themselves in writing."[47]

1.19 Nevertheless, I think the following observation should also enable anyone to realize that Christianity[48] is notable for its antiquity. For there was not yet even knowledge of writing among the Greeks when Moses' books[49] had already been written, since Cadmus had only just brought over the alphabet to them from the Phoenicians.[50] Nevertheless, Solon,

[45] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. [46] Cf. Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 14.2.
[47] Plato, *Ti.* 22b, 23c. Cyril has taken this passage from Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 12. Ps-Justin had already shortened the Egyptian's speech, and Cyril has adopted his truncated version. The passage was also cited at Clement, *Str.* 1.15.69.4; Eusebius, *P.e.* 10.4.19.
[48] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [49] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. [50] Cf. Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 12.2.

the inventor of the Athenian laws, and indeed also Plato himself, who had both gone to Egypt to give themselves the appearance of knowing more than other people, no doubt also marveled at Moses' books.[51] [38]

And one may see from their actual writings that the Greek historians were extremely well acquainted with Moses. For Polemon, in the first book of his *Greek Histories*, mentioned him, as does also Ptolemy of Mendes and indeed also Hellanicus, Philochorus, Castor, and others besides these.[52] And Diodorus, having investigated[53] Egyptian matters, claims that he heard information about Moses from the wise men in Egypt and has written word-for-word as follows:

> For after the establishment of settled life in Egypt in ancient times, which according to the myths occurred in the period of gods and heroes, they say that the first person to persuade the multitudes to use written laws was a man who was great in soul and who was, of those memorialized among the Jews, the most innovative in his way of life, namely Moses, who was called "god."[54]

For since they observed with wonder that Moses was full of every virtue, they even called him "god," which, I believe, is a way some of those in Egypt show honor. Or perhaps they had noticed what was said to him by the God over all, "Behold, I have made you a god to Pharaoh."[55] [39]

1.20 So then, as for the topic of antiquity, I believe that we have developed a sufficient argument, containing clear and unimpeachable proof, which demonstrates that Moses' books[56] go back earlier than the wisdom honored among the Greeks and contain the older view. That done, I now think we must examine[57] the view the Hebrews held about God and about the origin, or rather fashioning, of the world, and must then make

[51] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. While Augustine initially took a similar line, believing that Plato had encountered Moses' books in Egypt, he had changed his mind on this point by the time he composed *C. D.* 8.11 after scrutinizing the chronology it would have required, though he still recognized significant similarities between Plato's ideas and Moses'.

[52] Cyril has taken these names from Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 9, who lists Polemon, Apion, Ptolemy of Mendes, Hellanicus, Philochorus, Castor, Thallus, Alexander Polyhistor, Philo, Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus.

[53] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσας; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[54] Once again, Cyril has taken this passage from Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 9. The original version in Diodorus Siculus, 1.94.1 was about Menes (Μνεύην), a legendary Pharaoh of Egypt, but at some point, either in Ps-Justin or his source, the name was changed to Moses (Μωσῆν). There are several other differences between the version of the passage in Ps-Justin and the original in Diodorus Siculus. Moreover, Cyril has conflated into a single quotation two passages from Diodorus Siculus that Ps-Justin originally quoted separately (1.94.1 and 1.94.2).

[55] Exod 7:1. Cf. *c. Iul.* 9.12, where Cyril makes a similar point about Enosh based upon Gen 4:26.

[56] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως.

[57] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῆσαι; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

clear for our readers the views taken up by the wise men of the Greeks.[58] For in those areas in which they are in harmony with the words of the God-breathed scripture, one will see that the Greeks outdo themselves and agree with one another. But in those areas in which each of them gives an explanation of his own inventions, it's all too easy to show that they disagree with one another and are drunk with strange views.

For it would by no means be possible [for them] to perceive matters surpassing our mind and innate rationality, without the God who rules everything infusing [their] mind with light, giving birth to an interior wisdom, extending [their] faculty of speech, and allowing them as far as possible to understand and express some aspect of the ineffable realities about him. But such a grace would not come upon everyone indiscriminately, but rather only upon those who have transcended the passions of
[40] the flesh and are free from earthly impurity, who are mentally sound and experts in the virtuous deeds that lead to piety. The God of the universe incites us to this end when he says through the voice of David, "Be still and know that I am God,"[59] and indeed our Lord Jesus Christ also says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, because they will see God."[60] Now the nature that is above all would be seen not by the eyes of the body, but by the inner, hidden eyes of the mind, which focuses its subtle and precise curiosity on him and takes in the rays of the vision of God through imagery transcending sense-perception.

1.21 Hence, the people who were born from Adam until Noah revered one God, he who was by nature and in truth the fashioner of the
[41] universe and its Lord. For none of them were accused of inclining towards other gods or ascribing worship to unclean daemons. But after the flood, the building of the tower, and the differentiation of languages, the very view of God held by those scattered throughout all the earth also came to be irreconcilable. For once they had withdrawn the mind from the truth and anchored it on the shores of fleeting and earthly affairs and bodily pleasures, they departed into every kind of the worst absurdities and they parcelled out among themselves, so to speak, the crimes of the polytheistic error.

Thus, while some surmised that the sky is god, others said the same about the sun and moon, in addition to the stars and the elementary principles of the world – fire, water, air, and earth, out of which each

[58] These two topics will occupy Cyril for the remainder of book 1: setting out Moses' view of God (*c. Iul.* 1.21–34) and surveying the relevant views of the wise men of the Greeks (*c. Iul.* 1.35–50).
[59] Ps 45(46):11. [60] Matt 5:8.

particular thing is said to have been constructed. And still others slid even further towards the ultimate stupidity and got lost in such vulgarity [42] of reasoning that they built up temples and sacred precincts, lavishing upon them the costliest materials, and set in them statues and monuments to humans, weeping over those who had died and regarding them as gods, even daring to honor them with drink offerings and sacrifices.

There are, therefore, a great many people who go through life ascribing to the elementary principles of the world the glory that is due to God alone. But this indictment applies to the Chaldeans more than all the rest: on the one hand they calculate the movement of the stars with the greatest curiosity, and on the other hand they make the flights of birds a pretext for divination.[61]

1.22 But, as I said already, the divine Abraham did not adhere to their stupid ideas. For he deplored their proclivity for regarding God's supreme nature, which transcends everything, as one of those visible things that are subject to sense, and he indeed did not fall short of the truth by confining the divine nature to the creaturely realm. Rather he restored it to its lofty place and placed it above everything called into existence and [43] thus he understandably became something of a marvel. It was for this very reason that he was received by God. For the one whom he was seeking eventually made himself known to him.

Therefore, let us see what sort of view our forefather Abraham appears to have held, and then which of those figures who came after him will be able to clarify his characteristic faith and view. Now it seems to me that Moses could fulfil this purpose for us, since he descended from him and thought it fitting to adopt for himself the exact same ideas that he knew Abraham had held, passing these down in writing.

1.23 Consequently, in composing the book of *Genesis*, he said that after certain persons had ravaged the forces of Sodom, they then took Lot and several others captive and rejoiced that they had been victorious. But their hope was foiled when Abraham orchestrated a surprise attack and took them by force, and then released all those who had been captured. And when he returned "from the slaughter of the five kings" (for so it is written),[62] Chodollogomor, the king of Sodom begged him, saying,

[61] Julian discusses Chaldean astrology and divination in connection with Abraham in *c. Gal.* frs. 86–89 Mas., to which Cyril responds in *c. Iul.* 10.34–42.

[62] Cf. Gen 14:17. Cyril's version has the word "five," which is absent from the LXX version, though he may have added the word himself. If the latter, then he has incorrectly said "five" rather than the four kings mentioned in Gen 14:9 (Chodollogomor plus three others who fought alongside him). Cyril has also confused Chodollogomor, king of Ailam, with Bara, king of Sodom (cf. Gen 14:1–2).

[44] "Give me the men, and take the cavalry for yourself."[63] Now Abraham refused to make the losses of someone else a recompense for his acts of courage, so he swore an oath not to take the goods, saying, "I will stretch forth my hand to the Most High, who has created the heaven and the earth, if I shall take from all your goods from a small cord to a sandal strap, lest you should say, 'I have made Abraham rich.'"[64]

And the "king of Salem," that is Melchizedek, also honored him as the victor. For he blessed him with these words, "Blessed be Abraham by God Most High, who created the heaven and the earth, and blessed be God Most High, who has delivered your enemies to you as your subjects."[65]

And when Abraham sent one of his close associates or rather one of his most loyal servants into Mesopotamia and commanded him to bring back a bride for Isaac, he said, "I adjure [you] by the God of heaven and the God of earth."[66]

Therefore, the divine Abraham knew the one and only God, clearly confessed that he exists, and called him "Most High" and the generator
[45] of the universe, including things in heaven and things on earth.

1.24 Now surely the quality of being "high" is not something sensible, nor indeed is it understood as denoting a particular place or anything that one could take in a corporeal sense. Instead, it is understood as indicating that he is set over everything, in a manner befitting the deity, and that he has created both those things in the heavens and those things on the earth and even the firmament itself and of course the earth, I mean the very element of earth. And if everything has come to be by him, then he must undoubtedly also be other than everything else, and other according to nature, since he is neither created nor has he come into existence from non-existent things, but is rather uncreated, eternal, older than all time, and the first cause of the universe.

Therefore, as I said a moment ago, the divine Abraham clearly knew that God is one and used to offer to him alone pure and undefiled worship. But when time had sharpened his mind, leading to his advancement in correct understanding, it was then, yes then, that he received more subtle theological instruction. For he learned not only that there is one God, and none other besides him, but was also taught, still in types and practically mediated by the senses, that the fullness of the one unmixed nature is
[46] understood as denoting the holy and consubstantial Trinity.[67]

[63] Gen 14:21. [64] Gen 14:22. [65] Gen 14:19–20. [66] Gen 24:3.

[67] On Cyril's Trinitarian theology, the definitive study remains Boulnois 1994. See also Boulnois 2003. In addition to the section of book 1 that follows, much of book 8 of *c. Iul.* is also devoted to a discussion of Trinitarian theology (*c. Iul.* 8.18–33).

And why is that? Because to those only recently called "to knowledge of truth,"[68] who don't possess a mind well acquainted with contemplative knowledge, the "light" of the vision of God seems, and in fact really is, somehow "unapproachable."[69] For this kind of knowledge requires a mind firmly established, disciplined by training, one that knows how to look with keen sight, and, in addition to all this, has first of all made faith its companion. For it is the bedrock and unshakeable foundation of theology.[70] And the prophet Isaiah confirms this point for us when he says, "If you do not believe, neither shall you understand."[71]

1.25 Now how could anyone doubt that instruction through riddles is altogether necessary for people who are first encountering such subtle concepts, concepts that have, as it were, been filed down to an elegant polish (that is, concepts about God), when even the wise men of the Greeks were not ignorant of this requirement? Porphyry, who has a noble [47]
reputation among them for his worldly learning, says in the first book of his *Philosophical History* something like this about the so-called "wise men," or better put, those who have a reputation for thinking that they are wise:

> For, he says,[72] because they [i.e., the Pythagoreans] were not able to express clearly in language the first forms and the first principles due to the difficulty of understanding and explaining them, they had recourse to numbers on account of the clarity of this form of instruction, thereby imitating the geometricians and the teachers of grammar. For when the latter are intending to convey the functions of sounds and the sounds themselves, they use letter forms, asserting in an initial lesson that these letter forms are the sounds. Later, however, they teach that these letter forms are not sounds, but that through them a conception of the true sounds arises. As for the geometricians, because they are not able to set forth incorporeal forms in language, they have recourse to diagrams of shapes and say, "This is a triangle." However, they do not mean that the triangle is the one that falls before the eyes. Rather, by setting forth a diagram that can be seen, they present the idea of the triangle.
>
> So the Pythagoreans did the same with respect to first principles and forms. Because they could not express the incorporeal forms and first

[68] Cf. 1 Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 2:25; 3:7.

[69] Cf. 1 Tim 6:16. This sentence is very similar to one in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.19 (PG 39.732a). Cf. Crawford 2020a, 249–51.

[70] Cyril similarly describes the Nicene creed as a "bedrock" (κρηπίς) and "foundation" (ὑπόβαθρα) at *Dial. Trin.* 1.389.15–21.

[71] Isa 7:9. On Cyril's use of this verse, see Crawford 2014, 226–28.

[72] The subject of the verb φησί is the Neopythagorean philosopher Moderatus of Gades whose account of Pythagoras Porphyry was reporting.

principles in language, they had recourse to an explanation relying on numbers. In this way they spoke of "the one," referring thereby to the
[48] rational principle of unity, to the rational principle of identity and of equality, and to the cause of the common animation and interconnectedness of the universe and of the preservation of that which is invariably in the same state.[73]

1.26 Accordingly, because the distinct and exceptional properties of the deity are "difficult to explain" and hard to expound, since they are not amenable to observation, and because whatever words one might use in talking about it would turn out to be altogether insignificant and would fall short of the divine dignity, we learn about it through more palpable "forms"[74] and types, as "in a mirror and in a riddle."[75]

We maintain that it was in this way that the divine Abraham received instruction.[76] For so it is written about him: "And God appeared to him at the oak of Mamre, while he was sitting at the door of his tent in the middle of the day. And looking up with his eyes he saw, and behold three men stood over him. And when he saw them, he ran forward from his tent door to meet them and prostrated himself on the ground, and said, 'Lord, if I have found favor before you, do not pass by your servant.'"[77] And a little further on it says, "He said to him, 'Where is Sarah your wife?' And he answered and said, 'Behold in the tent.' And he said, 'I will return and come to you at this time next year and Sarah your wife will
[49] have a son.'"[78]

Notice how with exceptional clarity it says "God appeared to him," yet there were "three men" that he saw, and, as he was running towards them, the divine Abraham did not say, as though he were speaking to three men, "Lords, if I have found favor before you, do not pass by your servant." Rather, calling the three men "Lord" in the singular, he thought it right that the three men should be coming down to him as one, since the three of them, being one, were also speaking as though from a single person: "Where is Sarah your wife?" and "I will return and come at this

[73] Porphyry, *VP* 48–49. Porphyry's *Life of Pythagoras* has come down in the manuscript tradition as a distinct treatise but was originally part of his four-volume *Philosophical History*, as Cyril knew it. The passage quoted here by Cyril is not cited in any earlier surviving author. Porphyry is in fact the non-Christian author most frequently quoted by Cyril in *c. Iul.*, almost always to express his agreement with Porphyry's view. See "Cyril's Sources" in the Introduction; and, for closer analysis, Boulnois 2020a, who comments on the present passage on p.451.

[74] The word translated here as "forms" (σχημάτων) is the same one translated in the passage from Porphyry as "shapes," referring to the diagrams of the geometricians.

[75] Cf. 1 Cor 13:12. [76] On the theophanies to the patriarchs, see also Augustine, *C. D.* 10.13.

[77] Gen 18:1–3. [78] Gen 18:9–10.

time next year." Observe, therefore, that there were three persons who appeared to Abraham and each one individually subsisted, yet by the principle of consubstantiality they were gathered together into one and were careful to conduct the dialogue in these terms.[79]

1.27 Now the images of such matters are to some degree vague and fall far short of the truth, even though they are necessary as a guide, I mean as a guide concerning matters surpassing mind and reason.[80] Nevertheless, the light of the divine vision enters into the purest of minds, and we somehow fly up from sensible things to realities higher than the senses [50] which transcend the power of our innate rationality. For everyone agrees that there is one divine nature that is "over all and through all and in all,"[81] but that it is expanded conceptually into a holy triad that is sacred and consubstantial – I mean the Father, and of course also the Son and the Holy Spirit. But even if each one of those named also subsists individually, being in truth what it is also said to be, still the principle of consubstantiality gathers them together into an undifferentiated nature. For the Son has been born from the Father and is in him and from him by nature, and the Spirit also proceeds, existing as God the Father's own Spirit, and likewise the Son's. For, through the Spirit, God the Father sanctifies that which has been naturally disposed to be sanctified.

So, then, our forefather Abraham was not unaware that the Craftsman of the earth and heaven and the universe, whose might holds sway in all domains, is the one worshipped in the holy Trinity. Now those descended from him, I mean Isaac and Jacob, didn't think any differently, but followed in the footsteps of their father's virtue and so became emulators [51] of his faith. The blessed Moses, for example, while telling us their story in his book about the creation, says the God of the universe appeared to Jacob, and that he made him feel certain of his good prospects by saying, "I am the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac."[82] And Jacob himself also promised, saying, "If the Lord gives me bread to eat and clothes to wear … then the Lord will be God for me."[83]

1.28 Now this is enough about them, but I also think I must finally turn the discussion to the divine Moses himself. For he too proclaims one

[79] *c. Iul.* 1.26.1–30 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 844. On patristic exegesis of this episode, see Boulnois 2020d, with a discussion of Cyril on pp.256–59. The collection of biblical testimonies known as Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* also cites the divine appearance at Mamre as a Trinitarian theophany and includes a loose paraphrase of Cyril's comments in *c. Iul.* 1.26.19–30 (*Test.* 1.6 Albl [PG 46.196d–197b]). On the relation of Cyril's *c. Iul.* to Ps-Gregory's text, see the note at *c. Iul.* 8.11.

[80] *c. Iul.* 1.27.1–3 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 844. [81] Eph 4:6.

[82] Gen 28:13. [83] Gen 28:20.

who is truly God by nature and was not unaware of the one through whom all things have been brought into existence[84] – I mean his living and subsistent[85] Word – nor of the life-giving Spirit who is in God and
[52] from him, and who is sent through the Son to creation.

For he said, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."[86] After making him known with this statement as the generator of the universe, in a rather summary and brief manner, he goes on to elaborate the account and has shown that everything that previously did not exist was brought into existence through the living Word of the God who rules over all and is also given life in the Spirit. For he says, "God said, 'Let there be light,' and light came into existence. […] Let there be a firmament in the midst of the water […]' and thus it came into existence."[87] And anyone can see that, for every created thing, the Father says, "Let this or that particular thing exist," and brings into existence through the Word the very thing that he intended, without any delay. "For the Word of God is living and active,"[88] and if he should give a mere assenting nod, what he has decided exists. Moreover, he said, "The earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was upon the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the water."[89] Hence, he quite clearly mentions the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And in other ways too he proclaims the one natural and true divinity in the holy and consubstantial Trinity. For when he released fire upon the Sodomites who
[53] had committed intolerable offenses, it says, "The Lord rained down fire and brimstone from the Lord upon Sodom."[90]

1.29 But, I should, I think, introduce into the discussion the following point that would be most especially beneficial for readers. About the fashioning of humanity it has been written as follows, "And God said, 'Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness."[91] Then a little further on he continues, saying, "And God made humanity; according to the image of God he made it."[92] For the Son is the "image" of God the Father, after whom we too have been modelled in an intellectual sense, and the nature of humanity has been enriched with this special privilege. For the beauty of the Craftsman flashes like light-
[54] ning within it.

[84] Cf. John 1:3.
[85] Gk.: ἐνυπόστατον. On the meaning of this term, cf. Boulnois 1994, 292–94; Boulnois, SC 624, 356 n. 2. It also appears at *c. Iul.* 7.33.3; 8.32.23; 8.38.12; 10.2.51.
[86] Gen 1:1.
[87] Gen 1:3, 6. Julian himself discusses the *Genesis* creation account in *c. Gal.* fr. 6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.18–19).
[88] Cf. Heb 4:12. [89] Gen 1:2. [90] Gen 19:24. [91] Gen 1:26. [92] Gen 1:27.

What then would those people say who oppose our arguments and feign piety by confessing that there is only one God, but not that he has begotten the Son from himself?[93] To whom did God say, "Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness"?[94] Wouldn't anyone reckon that it is the holy and consubstantial Trinity who speaks to itself about these matters, seeing how the all-wise Moses [55] wanted to show that the formation of humankind didn't occur without reflection on God's part, and was practically honored with prior deliberation? For although the uncompounded divine Intellect would not need examination, doubt, and inquiry about anything whatsoever – since as soon as something has been willed, that thing also exists, correctly and free from fault – nevertheless, as I said, the nature of humankind has been honored with a kind of prior deliberation.[95]

1.30 Now certainly we should not pass over in silence the arguments of the atheists. For in response to this they would probably reply straightaway, "For the Father has not, as you suppose and deem to be the right view, spoken to his own Word and to the Spirit. Rather, he has spoken to the secondary, inferior gods who are with him."[96]

Yet how is it not clear to everyone that even those accustomed to practice Greek philosophy thought it best to confess that there is one God, the Craftsman of the universe who is by nature beyond all things, and that any other "gods" (to use their expression), both intelligible and sensible, were made and brought into existence by him?

Plato, for example, says quite clearly,

> Therefore, first of all, in my view, we must make a distinction: what is that which always exists and has no becoming, and what is that which becomes [56] and never exists? Now one of these is that which can be apprehended by knowledge and with reason, which always exists in the same state, and again the other is that which one forms an opinion about using the unreasonable senses, which comes into being and passes away, and never exists.[97]

[93] Cyril perhaps has in mind Julian's own statements in *c. Gal.* fr. 67 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.2).

[94] Gen 1:26.

[95] On the unique manner of God's creation of humanity, cf. *c. Iul.* 1.33.6; 2.28.15; 10.32.29–33.

[96] Cyril again is probably referring to the view of Julian, who adhered to the cosmology in Plato's *Timaeus* which presents the so-called "younger gods" as cooperating with the Craftsman in the creation of humanity (cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.32–33]). See also *c. Gal.* fr. 27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.43), where Julian claims that Moses' account of the Tower of Babel reveals his belief in a pantheon of gods. Perhaps Julian made a similar statement about Gen 1:26 in a lost portion of his treatise.

[97] Plato, *Ti.* 27d–28a. Cyril might have taken this citation from Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 22.3, who similarly reads Plato's passage in light of Exod 3:14.

Now with the phrase "that which always exists and has no becoming" he names the highest nature that is too great to have been made – I mean the God of the universe who truly exists. For he himself says the following at one point to the hierophant Moses, "I am the one who exists."[98] As for "that which is becoming and never exists," by this phrase he means that which has been brought into existence from a state of nonexistence by a certain inexpressible and incomprehensible power of the God who fashions our whole universe.

It is, therefore, settled that I have quite clearly demonstrated, not only from our own sacred writings but also using what they themselves have come to think and to say, that everything has been brought into existence by God and that he himself has been allotted a nature that isn't shared with those things that he made. For that which has been created is situ-
[57] ated lower than the creator and is naturally inferior in every way to him.

1.31 If this is the account we follow on that topic, what then do those people say who suspect that the God of the universe said to other gods, "Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness"?[99] For if he wanted to mold the rational animal on earth in the image of the creatures, why would he introduce his own person along with them, saying "Let *us* make" and "according to *our* image"? But if, on the other hand, he considered it necessary to shape it according to the most divine beauty that is his alone, why then does he allow others to be imitated as well, or take their form into account – or whatever the right expression would be to describe such things? For an identity of nature and of excellence and of dignity would never be ascribed to the Craftsman and the creation, the generated and the ungenerated nature, the incorruptible and what is subject to corruption, assuming we are correct in saying that that which is understood in the category of "becoming" is unavoidably and invariably bound also to be liable to corruption.

1.32 For the divine Moses, peering into the future by the Holy Spirit's mystagogical revelations, took account of our circumstances, and how he did so I will now explain. For since the one, ineffable, and incomprehensible nature of God is understood in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, that is, in the consubstantial Trinity, he ensured that no one whose extreme folly had led him to improper notions might say that humankind has been made "according to the image" and "according to the likeness" of God the Father, but not also that of the Son – and of

[98] Exod 3:14. [99] Gen 1:26.

course it was also likely that someone would conjecture and assert the [58]
inverse, that humankind was made "according to the likeness" of the Son, but not also that of the Father. To avoid this, Moses, perceiving in advance, as I said, that contrived arguments would at some point arise among certain individuals, said that the holy Trinity said to itself, "Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness,"[100] in order that [humankind] might be understood as modelled according to the entire ineffable nature of the divinity, in an intellectual sense that is.

And yet those who fancy themselves exceedingly clever think that these things are idle nonsense leading nowhere and, finding the light of the truth unapproachable due to their sheer stupidity, they doggedly maintain that he perhaps makes this statement to certain illegitimate gods who are falsely so called. Yet would it not be right to suppose that the one who by nature is Craftsman would not have graced the nature of created things with the preeminent honor of his own glory and excellence? And by no means do we say that this is because he was envious[101] – why would he be?! – but because the nature of things made could never attain the excellence of the divine honors, nor, it seems to me, could it be enriched, in its essence, with any of those properties that naturally adhere solely and specifically to the ineffable nature. [59]

1.33 There is another reason why it is absurd to think that the Emperor and Lord of the universe said to other gods, "Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness."[102] For what could possibly have happened to him to make him take certain beings as coworkers or assistants, as it were, solely for the formation of humankind, while casually improvising[103] all the rest of the creation, I mean angels and dominions, rulers, authorities, intellectual powers, as well as heaven and earth, the sun and moon, stars and light, and, in brief, everything that is in the heavens and on the earth?[104] Would someone say that, as though suffering impotence or not having enough energy for this, he allows helpers to join him? But if some people choose to think in this way, would it not entail an accusation of extreme stupidity against them? For the divine is all-powerful and sufficient in itself for anything whatsoever and nothing is impossible for it.

Therefore, leaving behind the nonsense in these ideas, let us proceed to the alternative view, namely the necessary confession that the fullness of

[100] Gen 1:26.
[101] Julian accuses the Christian god of envy at *c. Gal.* frs. 17; 30 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.29; 5.6).
[102] Gen 1:26. [103] Gk.: ἀποσχεδιάσας. Cf. the note at *c. Iul.* 1.29.15–24. [104] Cf. Col 1:16.

the ineffable deity is understood in the holy and consubstantial Trinity. And we ourselves have been formed according to the true and most exact
[60] image of the Father, that is, the Son, and his divine beauty is intimated in our souls through participation in the Holy Spirit. For he too is in us, like the Son himself. For "the Spirit is the truth," according to scripture.[105]

1.34 This is how the all-wise Moses has truly initiated us into these mysteries, and the holy prophets who came after him, along with the apostles and evangelists, did not differ from his thinking on these topics. Rather, one and the same mode of theology is evident in them all, and one would find that they are not at odds with one another on any point at all. For with a true inspiration they speak words from one Holy Spirit. And our Lord Jesus Christ himself does not leave us in any doubt about this matter, since he says with utmost clarity, "It is not you who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father who is speaking in you."[106]

Hence, possessing an authentic view of God which has come down to us from above and from the holy fathers, we take pride in it. And we are not accustomed to forfeit it to those from the blood of Israel, as if it belonged to them instead – far from it! Rather, we count ourselves too among the children of Abraham. For we ourselves are his sons according to the promise.[107] And Paul also will convince us of this, since he writes, "For not all those who are from Israel are Israel, nor are they Abraham's
[61] children because they are his offspring. […] Rather, the children of the promise are regarded as Abraham's offspring."[108]

It would not be difficult to add a great many other things to what has been said about both our pure worship and the blameless view we hold concerning the God who rules over all. But since the principle of artful design demands that we assign the various insights to their appropriate time and place, I will pass over those things for now and instead direct my attention to the required discussion of Greek sources,[109] poring over[110] their books[111] and making an exact examination of the view of each of them.

1.35 Now they say that Orpheus, son of Oeagrus, was the most superstitious person of them all and came before Homer's poetry, naturally enough since he was also chronologically older,[112] and that he wove songs

[105] 1 John 5:6.
[106] Matt 10:20. On Cyril's view of the inspiration of scripture by the Spirit, see Crawford 2014, chapter 3; Crawford 2013.
[107] Cf. Gal 3:29. [108] Rom 9:6–8. [109] Gk.: τὰ Ἑλλήνων.
[110] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῆσαί; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[111] Gk.: τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς. [112] *c. Iul.* 1.35.1–8 = OF 373T Bernabé; *c. Iul.* 1.35.1–3 = OF 881T Bernabé.

and hymns for the gods who are falsely so-called, for which he won no ordinary reputation. Then condemning his own doctrines and realizing that he nearly left the highway and had lost the straight path, he converted to what was better and chose the truth over falsehood. He says the following about God: [62]

> I will speak to those to whom it is lawful. All you who are profane, shut the doors.
> Now listen, offspring of the light-bringing Memory,
> O Musaeus.[113] For I will utter true things. Let not the former impressions
> in your breast deprive you of cherished life.
> Look to the divine account and apply yourself to it,
> guiding aright the intellectual hollow of your heart. Tread well
> upon the path and look upon the only Master of the universe. […]
> There is one, self-generated. All things are sprung from him,
> and he is superior to them. Nor does any mortal being
> look upon him, though he himself sees everyone.

And again, a little further on, [he says],

> For he is firmly established in the brazen heaven,
> on a golden throne. With his feet he is planted upon the earth,
> and, as far as the boundary of Oceanus, his right hand
> on all sides he has stretched out. For the high mountains tremble
> along with the rivers and the depths of the hoary blue sea.[114] [63]

So then, God, who is through all and over all, he calls "one" and "self-born,"[115] saying that, while he has heaven as a throne, the earth lies under his feet – intending, I think, by this to signify the infinity of his uncompounded nature and the fact that it extends throughout all things and fills all things. And the fact that it grasps the universe is indicated by his hand stretching out to the very boundaries of Oceanus while mountains and sea, and basically the whole cosmos, tremble. For as the God-breathed scripture says, "All the earth calls upon the truth, and heaven blesses it, and all his works shake and tremble."[116]

So this is what Orpheus has to say about these matters. **1.36** But as for Homer, the best of the poets, someone would, I think, say he differed

[113] Other sources that quote this Orphic poem have Μήνης ("Moon") in place of Cyril's Μνήμης ("Memory").

[114] OF 245 Kern/377F, 1–7, 8–10, and 17–21 Bernabé. Cyril has taken these two passages from a longer quotation in Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 15–16. Versions of it were also cited in Clement, *Prot.* 7.74.4–5; *Str.* 5.12.78.4; Ps-Justin, *Monarch.* 105b; Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.12.5; *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.3 Beatrice; Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.30–31.

[115] Gk.: αὐτογέννητον, though the word used in the Orphic hymn is αὐτογενής ("self-generated").

[116] 1 Esd 4:36.

little from those dancers on stage. For, on the one hand, such persons, according to those fond of shows, are accustomed to portray the natures of things by their poses and nods and seem nearly to make the things themselves all but present to those watching.[117] And Homer's practice, on the other hand, is to make into gods both virtues and vices as well as the parts of the universe and even the very nature of the elements. For
[64] example, he says the gods formerly opposed one another at Ilion, and he relates clearly and in detail who faces off against whom:

> Now indeed opposite Lord Poseidon
> Phoebus Apollo took his stand, with his winged arrows,
> Gray-eyed goddess Athena countered warlike [Ares];
> The goddess of the golden spindle stood opposite Hera, clattering
> with her pouring arrows, Artemis, the sister of the far-shooter [Apollo];
> Hermes, stout and quick to help, stood opposite Leto;
> The great river [Xanthus] with its deep eddies countered Hephaestus.[118]

Observe how obviously keen he is in this passage to depict the virtues in a sense rising up in opposition to the vices. For while the Greek poets are accustomed to call Ares foolish, enraged, and even "double-faced,"[119] Athena they call most cunning and wily, and similarly they surmise that Leto is forgetfulness and Hermes memory and reason.

He then touches upon natural philosophy, and explains the distinction among the elements when he says,

> Now indeed opposite Lord Poseidon
> Phoebus Apollo took his stand, with his winged arrows […]
> The goddess of the golden spindle stood opposite Hera, clattering […]
> [65] The great river [Xanthus] with its deep eddies countered Hephaestus.[120]

[117] Cyril's mention of "poses and nods" (σχήμασὶ τε καὶ νεύμασι) seems to correlate to two of the three "elements of dancing" mentioned in Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales* 747B–748D (φορά, σχῆμα, and δεῖξις), who also explores the analogy between poetry and dancing to which Cyril alludes. See also Libanius' statement that the dancer "does not imitate [the gods] in stone but represents them in himself" (*Or*. 64.116).

[118] *Il.* 20.67–73. An overlapping section of text was also quoted in Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 2.5, though Cyril quotes one more line than Ps-Justin (who himself had cited one additional line prior to the quotation picked up here). The precise passage is also quoted in Heraclitus, *All.* 52.3, who similarly proposes that they be interpreted as a presentation of virtues and vices, offering the same exegesis of Ares, Athena, Leto, and Hermes highlighted by Cyril (54–55). In light of this similarity, as well as the one noted below, it seems probable that Cyril was either drawing on Heraclitus or at least the tradition of allegorical exegesis he represents; cf. e.g., Porphyry, *On Images*, frs. 356.4–7; 359.60–62, 106–110 Smith.

[119] *Il.* 5.831.

[120] *Il.* 20.67–68, 70, 73. These precise lines are also quoted and interpreted as a physical allegory in Heraclitus, *All.* 56–58, whose interpretation is a more expansive explanation of the identifications here offered by Cyril. Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.26.1–7, where Cyril again refers to the view that the gods are identified with the elements.

For it seems to me that here he calls the watery substance "Poseidon," the sun "Apollo," the air "Hera," the moon the "goddess of the golden spindle, clattering," and fire "Hephaestus," while he regards the "river" as standing in for the cold.

1.37 Nonetheless, even if Homer displays excessive fondness for myths, still we will not find him completely ignorant of the truth. For at one point he also says,

> […] Not even if God himself were to promise,
> Stripping away my old age, to make me a young man in my prime.[121]

For he does not anywhere say, "Even if *a certain one* of the gods should promise me deliverance from old age, and the recovery of youth," but he has instead confined the matter to the only God over all, attributing to his powers alone the ability to accomplish everything effortlessly, even what is beyond hope and human reason. He says "not even if God himself were to promise," and "God himself" wouldn't signify one of the gods fabricated in myths, but instead he who is the only true God. [66]

But, while Homer saw fit to think and to speak in this manner, let us now go on also to those haughty and supercilious persons, who have obtained no lowly reputation among the children of the Greeks[122] for thinking that they are wise.

1.38 Now Porphyry, who has rained down nasty statements upon us and practically dances in triumph upon the Christians' worship,[123] says that the so-called "wise men," who were seven in number, snatched this title for themselves on the following pretext (as he writes in the first book of his *Philosophical History*):

> Although there were nine, seven came to be called "wise men" for the following reason. When a fisherman was selling his catch of fish to some young men, it came to pass that a golden tripod was discovered in his net. And when the fisherman said he had sold the fish but not the tripod and the young men attributed the discovery to their good fortune, they chose

[121] *Il.* 9.445–46. The same lines were also quoted by Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 17.2 and 24.2, though in the first line Cyril omits the word κέν, which is also in the received text.

[122] On the metaphor of "children," see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.4.5.

[123] Cyril refers to Porphyry's *Against the Christians*, which he may only have known second-hand (e.g., from his reading of Eusebius) since he nowhere evinces direct awareness of details of that text; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.21.20–21. According to the Suda (a Byzantine encyclopedia), Porphyry's treatise comprised fifteen books (Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγους ιε′). The fairly recent assertion that there was no discrete multivolume work entitled *Against the Christians*, but rather that the tag was merely a descriptor of another work or collection of discrete works whose content or intention was "Against the Christians," has gained some initial acceptance in various quarters. Nonetheless, the assertion faces insurmountable evidence to the contrary; see Goulet 2004; Becker 2016, 15–22.

to leave the decision up to the god. And when the god responded with an oracle telling them to give the tripod to the wise man, the tripod was offered to Thales first, but he handed it off to Bias, saying he was the wise man. And he sent it to another and that one to another, until, after the tripod had been passed around to seven [of them] and then returned again to the first person, they decided to dedicate it to the god, since he was the
[67] wisest of them all.[124]

What sort of views these people held we will discuss when the time is right. For Thales the Milesian says that God is an Intellect of the cosmos, while Democritus of Abdera agrees with him in one respect, but adds still something else. For he himself also confidently maintains that God is Intellect, but in a fiery sphere, and that God is the soul of the cosmos. Meanwhile Anaximander takes a completely different path, defining God as the infinite cosmoses, whatever that means. **1.39** But the person who has the most formidable and marvelous gift for testing ideas – I mean Aristotle the Stagirite, the disciple of Plato – calls God the separable form, and contends that he is mounted upon the sphere of the universe. Yet again those called "Stoics" say that God is a designing fire that makes its way for the purpose of generating the cosmos. The views of these people have been recounted by Plutarch and other elite ranks among the Greeks, along with that man who arrogantly opposes us, Porphyry.[125]

Do they not, therefore, disagree with one another? And, as for men drunk with such diverse views, do they not reveal themselves to be those who merely guess at random rather than people who can discern the truth?[126] Yet if they had true and unwavering knowledge, they ought not to have opposed each other's ideas in any way whatsoever, just as one can,
[68] of course, see is the case with respect to us.

[124] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 1, fr. 203 Smith. The Porphyrian fragment is not preserved in any other Greek source, but an expanded version does survive in Arabic. Different versions of the story are also recounted in Diogenes Laertius 1.27–33.

[125] The summary of theological views in this paragraph appears to be drawn from Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.7, 881df. Cyril will explicitly cite passages from this text at *c. Iul.* 2.14–15; 2.22; 2.52. The first sentence of the paragraph above is presumably an allusion to that later discussion. Cyril correctly reports most of the views he includes here, though he turns Anaximander's "heavenly stars" into "infinite cosmoses," the latter being a phrase that appears in another section related to Anaximander at Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.3, 875f. This passage from Ps-Plutarch was previously cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 14.16.1–10, who, however, could not have been Cyril's source, since his recounting of the views of Democritus and Anaximander differs.

[126] Gk.: στοχασταὶ δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας διαγνώμονες. Eusebius used similar language at *P.e.* 1.7.16, stating that the irreconcilable cosmological views of the Greek philosophers proved they were "based on guessing, not on apprehension" (ἐκ στοχασμῶν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπὸ καταλήψεως). Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.16.2–5.

But I suspect someone will respond to this by saying, "What are you saying, my fine fellow? For are there not many sects[127] also among you yourselves, with certain people splitting themselves off so as to think and speak differently?" Nevertheless, good sir – I would say – those in the beginning who were our first teachers in the holy doctrines all agree with one another, and those in between and those who came last, agree with those who were first. For it is not the case that Moses thought one thing, while those after him issued teachings that are at odds with his ideas. Rather, as I have said, there is a single account of God espoused by all of them, up to and including the holy apostles and evangelists. **1.40** For they all confess that there is one God who is "over all and through all and in all,"[128] who has no beginning and is eternal, unbegotten, incorruptible, life and life-giving, maker of heaven and earth and, in short, of all that is in them. But if some of those who came after them did not understand what they had said and utterly missed the truth, then according to the right line of reasoning, the accusation of being mistaken will apply not to the former people, but to these latter ones.

Therefore, if the originators of their innate stupidity and instructors of unholy doctrines agree with one another's views, let them prove it and then I will concede. But if their earliest representatives themselves differ from one another and hold divergent views, how is it not clear to everyone that they deviate from the straight and beaten track and have gotten lost? For if someone should want to learn very well the correct and [69] genuine theology about the God who is beyond all things, whose view should he accept so as not to miss the mark? For Thales and Anaximander and the others we have just mentioned can be caught spouting random nonsense. But Pythagoras and Plato, having spent time in Egypt and encountering many people there, inasmuch as the two of them were the greatest lovers of learning and inquiry, were not unaware of Moses' virtue. For the facts about Moses were regarded by the Egyptians with no small degree of wonder. I think it was from there that they gained a thorough understanding of this theology with all due sophistication, and thereby came to hold views about God that are in some sense more reasonable than the others and indeed decided to conduct their thinking accordingly. And we will find also among the Athenians some who have agreed with what they took to be right.

[127] Gk.: αἱρέσεις. Julian himself refers to competing Christian factions with differing ideas at *c. Gal.* frs. 48; 64; 80 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.31; 8.15–16; 10.8). Celsus had previously raised the issue as a charge against Christianity, with Origen responding in turn. Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 3.10–13; 5.61.

[128] Eph 4:6.

1.41 I think I must honor with mention and remembrance the Egyptian Hermes, the one they say is actually called "Thrice-Greatest," since the people at that time honored him <as a god>[129] and, according to the opinion of some, compared him to the son who legend has it was born from Zeus and Maia.[130] So, then, this Hermes from Egypt, despite being a priest and always sitting in the temples full of idols, is found to have had the same ideas as Moses[131] – even if not correct and blameless in
[70] every way, still at least in part. For he too has derived benefit from Moses.

Someone at Athens who composed the fifteen books called *Hermaica* has also made mention of him in his writings. For he writes the following about him in the first book, and has introduced one of the priests saying,

> Therefore, so that we may start our discussion over again on equal footing,[132] have you really not heard that our Hermes also divided the entire land of Egypt into lots and portions, measuring out the land by acre,[133] and has cut ditches for irrigation? And that he established the nomes[134] and has named the regions after them, and that he established

[129] We follow the GCS editors in supplying "as a god" based on parallel passages about Hermes Trismegistus in Lactantius where he is said to be held *ut deos* or *in numero deorum* (*Epit.* 4.4; *Div. inst.* 1.6.1, 3; *De ira Dei* 11.12).

[130] As Cyril hints here, there was a diversity of accounts in antiquity about Hermes Trismegistus ("Thrice-Greatest"). According to Ps-Manetho, there were at least two figures with the name Hermes: a first Hermes was associated with the Egyptian god Thoth; a second was his grandson who translated his works into Greek "after the flood" (Ps-Manetho, *Sothis*, FGrHist, 609 T 11a and F 25). Julian himself (*c. Gal.* fr. 37.9–10 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 5.33.8–9]) seems to suppose that his designation as "Thrice-Greatest" derived from his "thrice" visiting Egypt. Cicero, *N.D.* 3.56 (cited at Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 1.6.2–4) asserts that it was the fifth Hermes who had made a sojourn to Egypt who received the epithet Thrice-Greatest and became equivalent to the Egyptian god Thoth. Augustine *C. D.* 18.39 (cf. 8.23–26) refers to him as the grandson of the first Hermes. Hermias (a Neoplatonist roughly contemporary with Cyril) notes that he "often visited Egypt and was called the third" (*in Phdr.* 2.99). According to John Malalas, the fourth-century Alexandrian philosopher Theon, father of the famous Hypatia, wrote commentaries on the books of Hermes Trismegistus (*Chron.* 13.36.38–40 Thurn). In addition, Hypatia's student Synesius was possibly influenced by the Hermetic corpus (cf. *Dion* 10.5; Cameron and Long 1993, 290–300). The corpus attributed to him, which slowly accumulated over several centuries, was marked by Platonizing language and held special fascination for Christians; see Fowden 1986, 22–44; Copenhaver 1992, xiii–lix; Edwards 2015, 142–48. Cyril preserves many unique Hermetic fragments, including the one below.

[131] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως.

[132] The editors of the GCS text have marked a lacuna after the phrase εἰς τὰς ὁμοίας, but this supposition is unnecessary if one reads the phrase as a Platonic idiom derived from wrestling and applied to dialectical or argumentative contexts. See the same phrase at *Phdr.* 236b and *Phlb.* 13d, and see the discussion of its meaning at Hermias, *in Phdr.* 1.49.

[133] The word translated here as "acre" is σχοίνῳ, which normally means "reed" but was also a specific Egyptian unit of land measurement. The latter is probably what is meant here.

[134] The Greek word for the regional districts of Egypt (νομός = "nome") is identical to the Greek word for "law" (νόμος) except for a difference of accent. The GCS text here reads νομοὺς ("nomes") but the apparatus observes that νόμους ("laws") could be the correct reading, in which case the sentence would mean that νομός came into use to refer to the districts by appropriation from the prior usage of νόμος.

> contractual obligations? And that he recently produced a catalogue of the stars' ascendance and cut plants [for medicine], and, that he discovered and transmitted [the art] having to do with numbers, calculations, and geometry, as well as astronomy, astrology, music, and grammar?[135]

I will accordingly narrate the views of each of these people, and I will recall others as well who obtained a remarkable name among them for their learning.[136] I should add that those about to read the following need to attend to their writings with the greatest love of learning instead of becoming quickly sated and bored. [71]

1.42 Pythagoras, for example, says,

> God is one, and he is not as some suppose, outside the universal order, but is in it, wholly present in the whole sphere, watching over all generations, being a mixture of the entirety of the ages and the administrator[137] of his own powers and works, first principle of all things, giver of light in the sky and father of all, intellect and animation of the universe, the motion of all the spheres.[138]

Observe that he clearly says the God of the universe is "one" and "first principle of all things" and one who actualizes "his own powers," and, moreover, that he is "the giver of light," "the animation (that is, the life-giving process) of the universe," and "the motion of all the spheres." For nothing is self-moved, but all things have been produced by him and have clearly received from him the movement from nonexistence into existence.

Furthermore, Plato somewhere utters the following:

> It is difficult to discover the father and maker of this universe. To express him to everyone on finding him – impossible.[139] [72]

[135] Although Nock and Festugière did not include this passage in their edition of the Hermetic corpus, Litwa added it in his English translation among the testimonies to the corpus, designating it TH 21 (Litwa 2018, 292). Cyril is the only ancient author to mention a fifteen-book *Hermaica* from Athens, so unfortunately we know nothing else about this source, from which he presumably took this and the Hermetic passages he quotes. See the discussion at Nock and Festugière 1946, 1: xl; Fowden 1986, 27; Copenhaver 1992, xlii.

[136] Gk.: ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ.

[137] Following Riedweg 2020a, 283, we adopt the reading ἐργάτας in place of φῶς in the GCS edition.

[138] Ps-Pythagoras, *Fr.inc.* 186.14–19 Thesleff. This passage had been previously cited in Clement, *Prot.* 6.72.4 and Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 19.2. It does not survive in any other sources. The version cited by Cyril differs in a few details from that preserved in the two earlier sources.

[139] Plato, *Ti.* 28c3–5, cited previously in Clement, *Prot.* 6.68.1; *Str.* 5.12.78.1; Origen, *Cels.* 7.42. Also cited in Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.42; Zacharias of Mytilene, *Amm.* II, 674–75. Julian himself alludes to the passage at *c. Gal.* fr. 7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.23).

He is quite correct. For, "The glory of the Lord conceals verbal expression,"[140] as it is written, and all talk about him is feeble and falls short of his dignity. For he is beyond every concept, and when it comes to matters pertaining to him we see "through a mirror" and "in a riddle," as the all-wise Paul says.[141]

1.43 Moreover, Porphyry says in the fourth book of his *Philosophical History* that Plato held the view – and, moreover, expressly said about the one God – that no name is suitable for him, nor can human knowledge comprehend him, but rather it predicates of him names that are used of lesser beings, although in an inexact sense:

> And if one really must be so bold as to say something about him using the words in use among us, then the names "One" and "Good" should especially be applied to him. For the former indicates his simplicity and the self-sufficiency that results from it. For he needs nothing – no parts, no substance, no powers, no activities – but is the cause of all these things. The name "Good," on the other hand, shows that everything that is good is from him, while other things – if one must say so – imitate this
> [73] attribute of his, insofar as they are able, and are preserved through it.[142]

Moreover, Hermes the Thrice-Greatest says something like the following:

> To understand God is difficult, and, even for the one who can understand him, to speak about him is impossible. For it is impossible for the corporeal to signify what is incorporeal; it is not possible for the imperfect to grasp the perfect; and it is difficult for the eternal to associate with the ephemeral. For the one always exists but the other passes away; and the one is true but the other is overshadowed by appearance. Therefore, to the degree that what is weaker differs from the stronger and the lesser from the greater, so also does the mortal differ from the divine and immortal […]
>
> Therefore, if there is some incorporeal eye, let it leave the body for the vision of the beautiful and let it fly and be raised aloft seeking to behold, not a shape or a body or forms, but rather that maker of these things, the silence, the calm, the stability, the unchangeable, the Everything and Alone, the One, that which is from itself, that which is in itself, that which is like itself, which is neither similar to anything else nor dissimilar to itself.[143]

[140] Prov 25:2. [141] 1 Cor 13:12.

[142] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 220 Smith. Cyril goes on to cite three more passages from Porphyry's *Philosophical History* in the remainder of book 1. On these four passages, cf. Boulnois 2020a, 454–60.

[143] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 25 Nock and Festugière. The first line of this passage was also cited in Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr*. 38.2; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or*. 28.4. A slightly different version of it was included in John Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 2.1.26. The parenthetical ellipses in the translation above mark a presumed gap in Cyril's quotation based on a comparison with the version in Stobaeus.

1.44 And again Hermes says,

> Therefore, any time you are reflecting on him who is the One and only Good you should say that nothing is impossible for him since he is absolute power. You should not imagine that he is in anything, nor again that [74]
> he is outside of anything. For being limitless, he is the limit of everything, and, being encompassed by nothing, he encompasses everything. What then is the difference between bodies and the incorporeal, between generated beings and the ungenerated, between beings subject to necessity and one with self-determination? Or the difference between the earthly and the heavenly, between the corruptible and the eternal? Is it not that one possesses self-determination while the other is subject to necessity? […] And that things below, being imperfect, are corruptible?[144]

Yet Sophocles too says the following about God,

> There is one God, in truth, one,
> who made heaven and the vast earth,
> the blue swell of the sea and the mighty winds.
> Many of us mortals, being led astray in our heart,
> have erected as consolation for our miseries
> statues of gods made of stone and wood
> or carved images in gold or ivory,
> and we suppose that we are being pious by making
> sacrifices and empty festivals for them.[145] [75]

And indeed the most wise Xenophon also says,

> The one who shakes everything while remaining at rest is perceived as a great and powerful being. But what sort of form he has is uncertain. Neither does the sun, which appears to shine upon all, seem to permit itself to be seen, but if someone should recklessly gaze upon it, he destroys his sight.[146]

1.45 Therefore, the fact that there is truly one God according to nature, who transcends all thought and language, who is incomprehensible, formless, the giver of life and the origin of all, who is unbegotten, incorruptible, and the generator of the universe is plainly attested both by the God-breathed scripture and by the statements from their own poets and

[144] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 26 Nock and Festugière.

[145] Ps-Sophocles, TrGF 2.618. Cyril probably drew this passage from Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr*. 18.1. It was also cited by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 5; Clement, *Str*. 5.14.113; *Prot*. 7.74.2; Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.13.40; Ps-Justin, *Monarch*. 104c–d; Theodoret, *Affect*. 7.46; John Malalas, *Chron*. 2.14.50–54 Thurn; *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.54 Beatrice.

[146] Xenophon, *Mem*. 4.3.13. This passage was previously cited by Clement, *Prot.* 6.71.3; *Str*. 5.14.108.5; Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.13.35.

writers. But that they also knew the Son begotten from him according to nature, who is his creative Word, we shall now demonstrate through their
[76] writings, adducing the passages relevant to this topic.

Take, for example, what Porphyry says in the fourth book of his *Philosophical History*, with Plato speaking about the Good as follows:

> From this one [i.e., the Good], by some process inconceivable to humans there arises the Intellect that subsists entirely in itself, in which really existing things and all their substance reside. It is the primordial beauty and beauty-in-itself, possessing the form of beauty from itself. It processed before time began, dependent upon[147] God as its cause, though being self-begotten, as its own father. For its procession occurred, not because God moved it towards its creation, but because it passed from God through self-generation. Nor did it pass from a temporal beginning, since time did not yet exist. Not even when time came to be did time apply to it. For Intellect is always atemporal and alone eternal. But just as the first God is one and alone eternal, even though everything has come from him (since he is neither counted among them nor can their status be classified with his existence), so also the Intellect that is alone eternal, subsisting atemporally, is also itself the time of temporal realities, ever remaining identical to its own eternal reality.[148]

1.46 In addition, Orpheus also at one point says the following:

[77]
> I adjure you in the name of Heaven, wise work of the great God,
> I adjure you by the speech of the father, which he first uttered,
> When he established the entire world by his own counsel.[149]

Now by "speech of the father which he first uttered" he means his only-begotten Word, who always coexists with the Father. For there was no time when God the Father could be understood to exist without his own Word.[150] And in the same passage he also declared that God is the Craftsman of the universe.

[147] Following Riedweg 2020a, 283, we adopt the reading ἠρτημένος in place of ὡρμημένος in the GCS edition.

[148] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 223 Smith.

[149] OF 299 Kern/620F Bernabé. This passage had previously been cited by Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 15.2 and would later be cited by *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.36 Beatrice; John Malalas, *Chron.* 2.4.70–73 Thurn. Malalas explicitly states that Cyril had previously cited the passage (2.4.73–74 Thurn), though he attributes the lines to Hermes Trismegistus rather than Orpheus as Cyril does. Moreover, his version of it differs somewhat and includes a further line that identifies the father's "speech" with "his only-begotten Word," putting Cyril's gloss on the passage in the mouth of Hermes himself.

[150] Cyril's phrasing here echoes the fourth-century Trinitarian debates initiated by the Alexandrian presbyter Arius, who became infamous for arguing "there was a time when the Son was not." See, e.g., the letter of Alexander of Alexandria cited in Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 1.6.9.

And the Thrice-Greatest Hermes utters the following about God:

> For when his word processed, it was entirely perfect, fertile, and acted as the Craftsman in fertile nature; falling upon the fertile water, he made the water pregnant.[151]

Hermes again says,

> Therefore, the pyramid is the foundation of nature and of the intellectual cosmos. For it has the creative word of the master of all placed over it as its ruler, who is, after him, the first power, unbegotten and limitless, who emerged from him, and holds authority and rules over the beings formed [78] through him, and is the firstborn, perfect, and fertile legitimate son of the one who is entirely perfect.[152]

Again, when one of the temple-wardens in Egypt asked, "Why then, greatest Agathos Daemon, has the lord of all called him by this name?," [Hermes] replied,

> I also said this in the earlier discussion, but you did not understand. The nature of his intellectual word is a generative and creative nature. This is, as it were, his generative power or his nature or habit – call it whatever you want, so long as you understand this alone, that it is perfect in perfection and from its perfection it produces, creates, and endows with life perfect good works. Therefore, since he is of such a nature, he is rightly called by this name.[153]

Once more, in the first of the detailed discourses with Tat, Hermes says the following about God:

> The word of the Craftsman, my child, is eternal, self-moved, without increase or decrease, immutable, incorruptible, alone always like unto itself, equal, uniform, steadfast, well-ordered, existing as one after the God [79] who is known first.[154]

With this last phrase I think he indicates the Father.

1.47 These comments, then, suffice, I think,[155] for a most complete demonstration of the fact that they too had a notion of the only-begotten Word of God.[156] However, I think I must add to what I have said by also bringing forward their statements about the Holy Spirit.

[151] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 27 Nock and Festugière. This passage was later cited by *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.35 Beatrice; John Malalas, *Chron.* 2.4.67–69 Thurn.
[152] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 28 Nock and Festugière.
[153] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 29 Nock and Festugière.
[154] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 30 Nock and Festugière. This passage was later cited by *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.34 Beatrice.
[155] Following Riedweg 2020a, 283, we adopt the addition of ὥς γε οἶμαι.
[156] Cyril's last two sentences (= *c. Iul.* 1.46.33–47.2) were excerpted and included in *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.48 Beatrice.

For Porphyry, in explaining the view of Plato,[157] says,

> Plato said[158] the substance of the divine proceeded as far as three *hypostases* […], with the highest god being the Good, and after it in second place the
[80] Craftsman, and the World Soul as the third; for divinity processed as far as Soul.[159]

Behold how clearly in this passage he resolutely maintains that "the substance of the divine proceeded as far as three *hypostases*." For the God of the universe is one, but on the other hand our knowledge about him expands, as it were, into the holy and consubstantial Trinity – I mean the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, whom Plato also calls the "World Soul." And the Spirit gives life, since he[160] proceeds from the living Father through the Son, and "in him we live and move and have our being."[161] For our Lord Jesus Christ speaks truly when he says, "The Spirit is the one who gives life."[162]

Once more the same Porphyry says about Plato,

> That is why he [i.e., Plato] speaks in riddles and esoteric language about such matters, saying, "All things are around the king, and all things are for his sake, and he is the cause of all that is beautiful. And around the second [god] are the second [beings], and around the third [god] are the
[81] third [beings]."[163] For his [i.e., Plato's] meaning is that everything is around the three gods, but in fact first around the emperor of all, second around the god who comes from him, and third around the one from him.[164]

1.48 He has also manifestly shown that the process of individuation from one another[165] begins from the "king," and has shown the descent and subordination of those after the first by saying "first,"

[157] Cf. Plato, *Ep.* 2.312e.
[158] Following Riedweg 2020a, 283, we adopt the addition of ἔφη Πλάτων.
[159] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith. Cyril will cite a lengthier version of this passage at *c. Iul.* 8.27. The shorter version is also cited by Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.27 (PG 39.760b; cf. Crawford 2020a, 240–45), as well as in *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.38 Beatrice.
[160] Following Riedweg 2020a, we adopt the reading πρόεισι γάρ in place of καὶ πρόεισιν in the GCS edition.
[161] Acts 17:28. Cyril's last three sentences (= *c. Iul.* 1.47.9–16) were excerpted and included in *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.47 Beatrice.
[162] John 6:63.
[163] Plato, *Ep.* 2.312e. Following the suggestion of Boulnois 2020a, 454 nn. 65–66, we believe the two occurrences of περὶ in the second sentence of this quotation should be accented πέρι and have translated the passage accordingly. This passage was also discussed at Justin, *1 Apol.* 60; Clement, *Str.* 5.14.103.1; Origen, *Cels.* 6.18; Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.20.
[164] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 222 Smith.
[165] Gk: τὴν ἐξ ἀλλήλων ὑπόστασιν.

"second," and "third," and that all things are from one and are preserved through it.[166]

So then, he has theorized about this issue not in an entirely sound manner, but rather constructs his divisions and *hypostases* just like those who hold Arius' views, introducing the *hypostases* as subordinate to one another and supposing that the holy and consubstantial Trinity exists separately as three gods. Nevertheless, he was not entirely unaware of the truth. And I think that besides speaking and thinking soundly he would have made the complete version of the view of God public to everyone else too, if he had not been afraid of the accusation of Anytus and Meletus and of facing Socrates' hemlock.[167] [82]

Furthermore, Hermes too says in the third of his discourses to Asclepius,

> For it is not possible to present such mysteries to the uninitiated. Just listen with your intellect. There existed one unique and intellectual light prior to the intellectual light, and it exists eternally, shining intellect of intellect, and nothing else existed except the oneness of that one. Existing eternally in itself, it eternally contains everything by its own intellect and light and spirit.

[166] This sentence (= *c. Iul.* 1.48.1–5) has raised considerable interpretive difficulties, on which see especially Boulnois 2020a, 454–58. Hermann Schrader (1888, 365 n. 14) regarded it as a continuation of the fragment of Porphyry just cited. However, this is unlikely since the sentence seems to be commenting upon Porphyry's own statement in the immediately preceding sentence. Accordingly, Smith took it to be a comment by Cyril, as does the GCS edition of *c. Iul.* However, as observed by Boulnois, the phrase τὴν ἐξ ἀλλήλων ὑπόστασιν, with the use of ὑπόστασις in the singular (here translated as "the process of individuation"), is very odd coming from Cyril's pen, being more redolent of Neoplatonic thought (cf. the usage in the passage from Plotinus quoted at *c. Iul.* 8.33.25), and the theme of "preservation" (σώζεται) at the end of the sentence seems irrelevant to Cyril's purpose for citing the extract. She therefore raises the possibility that the sentence could be a remark from a third person who had cited Porphyry and was serving as Cyril's intermediate source for these Porphyrian extracts. On this scenario, Cyril mistakenly thought the passage from Porphyry included the present sentence and did not realize he was in fact quoting the unknown third author who had previously excerpted it. Though this hypothesis is admittedly speculative, Cyril does, in at least one other instance, undoubtedly make precisely this kind of mistake, inadvertently including a sentence from Clement of Alexandria in what he intended to be a quotation of Plato (cf. *c. Iul.* 5.38). Alternatively, it could be that Porphyry himself was quoting some other Neoplatonic source, in which case the sentence following the quotation of Plato, *Ep.* 2 would be from the other Neoplatonic text, with Porphyry himself entering with his own voice in the first sentence of 1.48. In short, the first sentence of section 1.48 seems unlikely to be Cyril's own words, but it is difficult to determine to whom it belongs.

[167] Anytus and Meletus were the accusers of Socrates. The idea that fear of suffering Socrates' fate prevented Plato from speaking publicly about the true doctrine of God is also expressed in Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 20.1.

And further on he says,

> Outside of this one there is no god, no angel, no daemon, no other substance. For he is lord of all and father and god and source and life and power and light and intellect and spirit, and everything is in him and under him.[168]

1.49 For, in my view at least, he calls the Son "intellect from intellect" as well as "light from light,"[169] and he also has made mention of the Spirit as
[83] "containing everything." Finally, he says that neither "angel" nor "daemon" nor indeed any other nature or "substance" lies outside of his divine preeminence, or rather authority, but he instead defines all things as under his authority and existing because of it.[170]

And again, the same Hermes in the same third discourse to Asclepius says the following when someone asked Agathos Daemon[171] about the divine Spirit:

> If it was not a part of the providence of the lord of all that I reveal this idea, then you would not be possessed right now with such a desire to look into this question.
>
> Now listen to the remainder of the discourse. All things need this spirit about whom I have often spoken before. For it bears up all things, giving them life according to their worth and nourishing them, and is dependent upon the holy fountain, eternally existing as a helper to spirits and as a source of life for all, while yet being one.[172]

[84] Therefore, he knew both that the Spirit exists individually, "giving all things life and nourishing them," and that he depends upon God the Father as "a holy fountain." For he goes forth from him by nature and is furnished to the creation through the Son.[173]

1.50 So then, having busied ourselves with their own books, as much as possible, we have made the view of each of them utterly transparent, so

[168] The two passages just cited are *Corp.Herm*. fr. 23 Nock and Festugière. They are similarly quoted in succession in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.27 (PG 39.757b–760a; cf. Crawford 2020a, 245–49); *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.32–33 Beatrice. They were also later cited as a single extract, with some variations, by John Malalas, *Chron*. 2.4.61–67 Thurn.

[169] Note that, whereas the passage just quoted speaks of a "light before light" (φῶς … πρὸ φωτός) and "mind of mind" (νοῦς νοός), Cyril glosses these phrases with the Nicene language of "mind *from* (ἐκ) mind" and "light *from* (ἐκ) light."

[170] The last three sentences from Cyril (= *c. Iul.* 1.49.1–7) were excerpted and included in *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.46 Beatrice.

[171] Following Riedweg 2020a, 283, we adopt the addition of the phrase τὸν ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα.

[172] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 24 Nock and Festugière. This passage was also cited in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.27 (PG 39.756b–757a; cf. Crawford 2020a, 245–49); *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.42 Beatrice; John Malalas, *Chron*. 2.4.59–61 Thurn.

[173] *c. Iul.* 1.49.17–20 was excerpted and included in *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia* 2.49 Beatrice.

that our future readers might know that, on the one hand, in sticking to their own ideas not a few of the Greek wise men have erred and adopted views contradictory to one another, while, on the other hand, there are some of them who did not fail to benefit from the Mosaic books since their love for learning drove them as far as Egypt. This latter group conducted their thinking in a manner better than the rest, and even came close to the truth, though certainly they did not keep their mind's eye entirely pure. In fact, I think one would not fall short of a fitting description if one were to call them people who are squinting at the truth.

Accordingly, I think my argument has been enough to show clearly that Christian ideas[174] are older and full of the truth; have been assumed to be right by a select group of elite ranks; and are incomparably better than the claptrap of the Greeks.

[174] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

Book 2

[85] **2.1** Because we considered it not at all unreasonable, or rather thought it useful and essential, to begin with the required account of who was chronologically born before whom and indeed also what sort of theological views each of them held, we have given the most precise explanation possible of these matters [in the previous book].

But perhaps someone might bring the following objection: "Since you have made it your purpose to advocate for the Christians' doctrines and are eager to oppose Julian's slanders with a helpful reply, why did you not think to follow this path straightaway, but have instead, as it were, diverted the momentum propelling the discussion directly to the appropriate topics by throwing yourself into genealogies and preparing an
[86] investigation[1] of the views of the Hebrews and the Greeks?" Let us now rebut such objections and contend that guiding the discussion in this direction was a good way to start.

For [Julian], emulating the Babylonian Rabshakeh,[2] was not afraid to rail violently with an unbridled tongue against God's glory and, having profanely cried out against our pure worship, he frequently mentions the wise men among the Greeks and crowns their false opinions with every praise, while at the same time he assaults the church's holy doctrines, despises Moses' narratives, and, in short, denounces all the saints too. For this reason, it was very reasonable for us to pile up in advance, as it were, raw material useful for refutations – that is, a clear and utterly compelling proof that the treatise of the most excellent Moses is older than the Greek wise men and, moreover, that anyone should realize the tradition

[1] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[2] Cf. 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 18:17ff. Gregory of Nazianzus had previously compared Julian to this Old Testament figure (*Or.* 4.110). The word "Rabshakeh" was originally a title for the chief cupbearer but was understood by early Christian writers as a proper name.

of the Christians' faith is incomparably superior to the views those people have propounded. Indeed, only in this way was it possible to rid the rest of the treatise of extensive digressions and any impression that I was, from time to time, being extensively distracted from consideration of the arguments at hand. [87]

Enough of such matters. **2.2** Now we must come to that man's actual book. Setting forth his lines word for word, we shall bring forward our own arguments in the order that is required, since we know that we must oppose his accusations in a noble fashion. And since, as I said, in opening his unrestrained mouth he has greatly defamed Christ, the Savior of us all, and hurls abusive statements at him, I will not mention such things. Instead, very sensibly passing over those parts of his book containing statements that might defile someone simply by encountering them, I will rise up against the essential points, showing that he is at every turn someone devoted to mockery and pointless nonsense, who completely lacks the ability to say anything true.

Furthermore, one should note the following. In the first book he proceeds through a great many ideas and does not stop flipping the same points over up and down and going around in circles, and, by inserting also at the middle and the end exactly what he can be found asserting at the start, he reveals that the words of his refutation have been made arguably without any kind of order. For it is entirely unavoidable that those determined to challenge his statements would appear to be constantly talking about the same thing, not once, but many times. Therefore, by dividing his book into an order that is more appropriate and sorting the topics it contains into categories, we will encounter each one, not multiple times, but only once, as far as each requires and with rhetorical skill. [88]

So he begins his discourse against us by saying,

Julian

It seems to me to be a good idea to set before all humanity the reasons that persuaded me that the Galileans' intrigue is a human fabrication[3] *constructed* [89]

[3] Gk.: πλάσμα … ἀνθρώπων. In his critique of Christianity Celsus mentioned πλάσματα at Origen, *Cels.* 2.26, probably referring to the stories in the gospels.

with maliciousness.[4] *Although there is nothing divine about it, by exploiting that childish and senseless part of the soul that has a fondness for myths, it gives*
[90] *its fairy tale the credibility of truth.*[5]

Cyril

2.3 Now when he says "*Galileans,*" he means, I think, the holy apostles, and by "*fairy tale*" he refers to the books of Moses[6] and the predictions and divine proclamations of the holy prophets. And perhaps he did not realize, or rather it was with the help of God, that he has in fact brought an accusation against his own superstition. For there are actually two Galilees: one is in Judea, while the other borders on and is a neighbor to the cities of the Phoenicians.[7] For example, on the one hand, in the gospels it is written concerning Christ, the Savior of us all, that "while walking by the Sea of Galilee"[8] (that is, the lake of Tiberias) he chose his disciples. And, on the other hand, God said at one point through one of the holy prophets, "And what are you to me, Tyre and Sidon and the entire Galilee of the foreigners?"[9] In addition, the divine Isaiah says, "The country of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali […] and the rest of those living by the sea […], Galilee of the nations […], the people sitting in
[91] darkness have seen a great light."[10] Therefore, the ones living in Judea are surely not the only people who should be regarded as "Galileans," but all the nations should be as well. For he says, "Galilee of the nations."

So then, it is ambiguous and not yet clear who would more properly and correctly be the target of his statement – whether it is directed

[4] Julian seemingly here refers to his apostasy from Christianity and decision to follow traditional Hellenic cultic practice. On his shift in religious views, see also *c. Iul.* Dedic.3–4 and the note *ad loc*. "Galileans" was Julian's preferred derogatory epithet for Christians. See, e.g., Julian, *c. Cyn*. 12.192d; *c. Her*. 18.224b; *Mis*. 28.357c; 35.363a; *Ep*. 90, 114, 115 (p.174.21, 193.3, 196.3 Bidez) (= *Ep*. 55, 41, 40 [pp.188–89, 128–29, 126–27 Wright]). For an overview of his use of the term, see Nesselrath 2020b, 2–5; also Niccolai 2023, 148–49. Although his treatise is usually given the title *Against the Galileans*, in the surviving fragments he in fact only uses the label here and in *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9). His derisive use of the term was also noted by other ancient authors: Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or*. 4.74, 4.76; 5.25; Ephrem, *Hymns against Julian* 3.17; Theodoret *H.e.* 3.8.1; Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.12.2–3; Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.4.5. The use of the term in this manner seems to be Julian's own coinage, though the Stoic philosopher Epictetus on one occasion mentions "Galileans" in passing and may have been referring to Christians (*Diss.* 4.7.6).

[5] *c. Gal.* fr. 1 Mas.; Wright 1923, 318–19. Gk.: τὴν τερατολογίαν εἰς πίστιν ἤγαγεν ἀληθείας. The accusation that Christians rely on a mere unreasoning "faith" was commonplace in anti-Christian polemic. Cf. Origen, *Cels*. 1.9; Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.1.11. In *c. Gal.* fr. 51 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.1) Julian uses similar language specifically with reference to the gospels.

[6] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως.

[7] The claim that there are two Galilees also appears in Eusebius, *Onomast*. 350 Timm.

[8] Matt 4:18. [9] Joel 4(3):4. [10] Isa 8:23–9:1 (Isa 9:1–2 MT); cf. Matt 4:15.

against us or against himself together with those who esteem the senseless superstition dear to him, since they too are "Galileans." Though, in fact, no one would have any doubt that the force of his words would fit the dumbstruck madness of the Greeks.

2.4 For where else is there so much that is mythical, foolish, and "*childish*," so much that is insipid, pointless, and full of every stupid idea, but solely among those who, by devising all sorts of fairy tales, even attempt to "*give the credibility of the truth*" to a falsehood? And the crudeness among them is even so great that also the select few who usually are the best at practicing their philosophy have denounced in the strongest terms the poets' madness, which is not inspired but bizarre, and have openly admitted that the appropriate thing to do would be to abandon their school of claptrap. For Plato in fact does not accept the poems of Homer,[11] who portrays gods and goddesses as, on the one hand, [92] condemned for their licentiousness and harmed by acts of human rapacity, and, on the other hand, as weeping and grieving over their dead offspring, saying "Woe is me"[12] like a woman, because they would like to snatch one of them away from death and yet are not able to do so. Instead, they yield to the Fates and surrender to Destiny, as apparently more formidable even than the one who outranks all the other gods, the one they actually call "Zeus the highest"![13]

Even though I could in fact say still much more on this topic, I will refrain from doing so, lest I seem to be carried away from what is relevant, and will instead come back to the point of the present discussion.

2.5 That which is "*mythical*" belongs to the Greeks and they are the ones who eagerly gave "*the fairy tale the credibility of truth*," drawing not on simple ideas but instead ideas contrived in an unholy manner with a love for "*maliciousness*," and they are the ones who "*constructed* an abominable *fabrication*" against the inexpressible glory of the God who rules over all and concocted this "*intrigue*" as a kind of snare for the souls of [93] simpler folk. For they led people throughout all the earth astray by saying that the heaven and all the other elements are god, and, as the all-wise

[11] Plato's criticism of Homer's deities was also highlighted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.7.4–8; 13.1–4; Theodoret, *Affect.* 3.37–41. Cyril will, in contrast, criticize Plato at *c. Iul.* 3.4 for accepting the stories of the gods recounted in Hesiod's *Theogony*.

[12] *Il.* 16.433a. Cyril will return to the theme of the gods' inability to rescue humans from death at *c. Iul.* 6.13.17–23; 10.15.24–53, referencing this same Homeric episode in the latter passage. It was also highlighted in Clement, *Prot.* 4.55.3; Athanasius, *Gent.* 11; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 2.2; Theodoret, *Affect.* 6.4. On the way in which ancient scholars handled the anthropomorphic emotions of the gods in Homeric poetry, see Nünlist 2009, 278–79.

[13] On Zeus's title, cf. *c. Iul.* 1.11.

Paul writes, "Though claiming that they are wise, they became foolish and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for images in the likeness of a corruptible human along with birds and animals and creeping things."[14]

But to ensure that we make room for his ideas as well – not hurling the accusation at others but instead allowing him to make an assault on the holy apostles, or rather the all-wise Moses himself and the holy prophets in one fell swoop – let him come and show clearly what is this "*fabrication maliciously constructed*," and what kind of "*fairy tale*" he takes it to be, and what aspect of the Christians' worship is "*fond of myths and childish*." Has Moses composed myths for us when he says there is one true God by nature, who is unbegotten, eternal, incorruptible, immeasurable, invisible, immutable, intangible, who is life and life-giving, wisdom, power, generator, King, and Lord of the universe? Has the message of the holy prophets fallen short of the truth, when it ardently followed in the footsteps of the Mosaic doctrines? Will we find the teaching of the holy
[94] apostles being any different in character? Certainly not!

2.6 If so, then how can he maintain that the Galileans' books "*have nothing divine*" in them and say that they are merely pointless myths and a "*fairy tale*"? Yet, wouldn't everyone agree that nothing could be better for humans than rightly and accurately discerning the one who truly is by nature the Craftsman and Lord of the universe? And I know that they too [i.e., the Greeks] would say that the most noble and excellent part of philosophy is said to be, and in fact is, the contemplative part,[15] by which matters that relate to God can become comprehensible for those capable of a more intellectual perception, though still with difficulty and only to the degree that is possible for humans.

And since he says "*he* himself *has been persuaded*," he ought to explain how this happened or who persuaded him. For he should not boast of being the only person who knows this. Now, if "*he has been persuaded*" all by himself and if, as he at least imagines and says, this is supposed to suffice as the most perfect demonstration of the fact that Christianity[16] is inadequate, I will not even bother saying that it is pure nonsense for him to do so. Nevertheless, let him go ahead and revel in arguments against us all by himself. For we will not submit ourselves to a judge that is so

[14] Rom 1:22–23.

[15] For the division of philosophy into "contemplative" and "practical" branches, see *c. Iul.* 1.17.15–17 (with note); 2.12.10–12. Julian had also privileged the contemplative over the practical; see *Ep. ad Themist.*, with Niccolai 2023, 39–65. Cf. Alcinous, *Didasc.* 2.

[16] Gk: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

extremely hostile. But if, on the contrary, he thinks the statements made by prosecutors against a given group of people ought to be true rather than false, then he should not say he has "*persuaded*" himself all alone [95] but should instead pursue a conviction on the basis of facts.

Furthermore, through what he has said we will again recognize that his indictment of mythmaking will justly fall upon himself rather than us, and that his accusation is suspect:

Julian

2.7 *Soon I will speak about all their so-called doctrines, but I want to say this first, that if my readers should wish to dispute what I say, they must act as though in a law court and not busy themselves*[17] *with anything irrelevant to the case nor, as the saying goes, bring countercharges, until they have successfully defended themselves against what I first have said. For it will be better and clearer if, whenever they wish to examine an idea of mine, they present it as a separate lawsuit, and if they bring no countercharges when they are defending themselves against my prosecution.*[18]

Cyril

Tell me now, must the one you are prosecuting be deprived of his tongue?[19] Are you ordering that the defendant be convicted in silence and that he settle for confirming the indictment against himself by mentioning absolutely none of your own views? Yet the fact that you do

[17] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν. While this term had become philosophically fraught as early as Plato (*R.* 4.433a8–9 and passim; cf. Plutarch's essay, Περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης or *De curiositate*) and clearly bears a negative connotation here, Cyril had himself already used the term in a favorable sense as "investigate" or "examine" in works apparently composed before *c. Iul.* (cf., e.g., *Glaph.* 69.44d; 69.68c; 69.73b; 69.89d; 69.172a; 69.212b). In *c. Iul.*, it seems that he uses the term in positive or negative ways at various times; we have therefore provided the Greek at each occurrence to alert readers that other connotations might be possible.

[18] *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas.; Wright 1923, 318–19. Cf. Aristotle, *Rh.* 1418b5–18, who said that one must answer all of the arguments set forth by one's opponent before offering proofs for one's own case. As emperor, Julian was of course the highest judge in the Empire and was highly acclaimed during his reign for his achievements in this domain. Cf. Libanius, *Or.* 18.182–88; Ammianus 18.1.1–4; 22.9.9; 22.10.1–7; 25.4.8–9; 25.4.19–21; Eunapius, *Hist.* fr. 25.1 Blockley. Gregory of Nazianzus unsurprisingly took a more critical view (*Or.* 5.20). In fact, according to Ammianus, Julian liked to boast that he was such an effective judge that the goddess Justice herself had returned to earth during his reign (22.10.6). His decision to frame his attack against Christianity in terms of a law court contest is in keeping with such imperial propaganda. On Julian as judge, see especially Schmidt-Hofner 2020.

[19] On Cyril's strategy of directly addressing Julian, here and throughout *c. Iul.*, see Brüggemann 2020, who observes that this rhetorical technique ("apostrophe") was especially common in courtroom oratory and was also used by Cyril's apologetic predecessor, Origen, in his *Contra Celsum*.

[96] not want us to say anything about your views is proof that you are afraid and are well aware of the distasteful shamefulness intrinsic to them.

If, then, while denouncing the Christians' worship he refrains from bestowing any praise at all upon the Greeks' superstition nor crowns it with the highest honors, he ought to demand the same treatment in return. But if, on the contrary, he prides himself in his words against us and ascribes the greater glory to his own poor counsel, comparing and contrasting [our ideas] with those of the Greeks as though they were superior, how then can he expect us to be silent and to make no mention at all of any of their ideas, given that, when we intend to advocate for our own doctrines, this is precisely the issue up for debate?

2.8 If, then, on the one hand, we had abandoned the needed rebuttal of your arguments [against Christianity] and had shifted our approach to follow a requirement that we mention only the views of the Greeks, I would say that his statement on this point is correct and not beyond the bounds of what is reasonable. But, on the other hand, when we are defending ourselves and want to reply to each and every one of the arguments he has made, how could it still be just for him to censure us for also choosing to advocate for our own side as we devote ourselves to stripping bare the ugliness of the Greek impiety?[20] For just as one can see the appearance of colors more plainly when they are contrasted with one another – for "the light shines in the darkness"[21] – in this same way, I think, the beauties that are rooted in the virtues would not otherwise be obvious to the
[97] minds of those more ignorant except only through the shamefulness of their opposites. For the absence of beauty in vice is what convinces someone that he ought to award the victorious verdict to the better party.[22]

[20] Cyril's argument in the preceding two paragraphs is compressed. It consists of two pairs of antithetical options regarding the content of the debate to be had, with Cyril's own view represented by the second option in each of them. 1) Cyril entertains the possibility that Julian might have simply criticized Christianity without valorizing Greek religion as the superior tradition and agrees that, if he had done so, it would be reasonable for him to exclude Christians from counterattacking with criticisms of Greek religion and forcing them to respond only to his objections. However, Julian does discuss Greek religion in his criticism of Christianity, treating it as the superior option, so Cyril cannot avoid addressing it as well. 2) Cyril states that he would be willing to discuss only Greek religion, presumably if Julian had not criticized Christianity. However, given that Julian has done precisely that and demanded that Christians defend themselves, Cyril must meet the challenge by both fending off the objections to Christianity as well as by counterattacking with critiques of Greek religion. In short, Julian's treatise critiques Christianity by presenting Greek religion as superior, so his insistence that readers not bring countercharges against Hellenism is, in Cyril's view, unjust and impossible to follow.

[21] John 1:5.

[22] Cf. Aristotle, *Rh.* 1418b3–4: "opposites are more noticeable when placed in juxtaposition" (παρ' ἄλληλα γὰρ μᾶλλον τἀναντία γνωρίζεται).

So this is why he is, quite understandably, afraid of what belongs to his own tradition and refuses to allow what he is ashamed of to enter into the debate, but demands silence, even from those who are under examination.

And he also brings other kinds of allegations against us, saying the following:

Julian

2.9 *It is worth considering for a moment whence and how a conception of God first came to us, then to set side by side what is said about the divine among the Greeks and among the Hebrews, and after this to ask those who are neither Greek nor Jewish but belong to the sect of the Galileans*[23] *why they chose the tradition of the Hebrews over ours, and, in light of this, why they in fact never adhere to the Hebrews' tradition but abandoned it and went their own separate way.*[24]

Professing not one thing that is noble or worthy of attention, either from the tradition of us Greeks or from the tradition the Hebrews received from Moses, [98]
and instead culling from both the features that became affixed like certain defects to <these> nations – on the one hand atheism from the Jewish villainy, and on the other hand a debased and lax manner of life from the apathy and vulgarity among us – this they wanted to be labelled the best form of godliness.[25]

Cyril

The one who imposed "*an order upon those reading*" the slanders he is going to bring against us, saying "*if they should wish to dispute what I say, they must act as though in a law court and not busy themselves*[26] *with anything irrelevant to the case nor, as the saying goes, bring countercharges*," clearly announces in these words that he will "*set side by side what is said about the divine among the Greeks and among the Hebrews.*" But what, then, does the comparative method look to as its aim and what goal could he possibly have in comparing the doctrines of

[23] Gk.: τῆς Γαλιλαίων … αἱρέσεως. On Julian's use of the term αἵρεσις to refer to Christianity, see also *c. Gal.* fr. 80.19 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.8.22) and the note *ad loc.*

[24] Julian here announces the theme of double apostasy that will be central to his argument in *c. Gal*: Christians first abandoned Hellenism for Judaism, and then, in an even worse degradation, failed to adhere to Judaism and invented their own false religion. He returns to this theme in *c. Gal.* frs. 58; 72 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.28; 9.22). See the Introduction to this volume for further discussion.

[25] *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas.; Wright 1923, 318–21. [26] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν; see note at *c. Iul.* 2.7.5.

the Hebrews, or rather Christians,[27] with those of the Greeks? **2.10** For you could not possibly say Julian has abandoned denunciation and given up his need to slander, and thus will treat his readers as unerring judges, so as even to wish to learn from them what is better or worse! Perhaps he thinks, and for good reason, that he would only find people who support
[99] the view of God that he holds if the doctrines of the Christians[28] are revealed to be corrupt and incur the shameful verdict through comparison with those of the Greeks. This, however, would never happen among those who know both the impotence of falsehood and the power of truth.

Nevertheless, observe this: by, as it were, issuing a law requiring us to be silent and to mention nothing from his tradition when we craft arguments on behalf of our own worship, he is found to be convicted by his own prohibition.

And since he also raises the question of why, having given up the doctrines of the Greeks,[29] we have inclined towards those of the Hebrews, come and let us say the same thing to him in turn, "Having given up the doctrines of the Christians[30] and run away from the truth, why do you love falsehood and mindlessly prefer such an utterly detestable self-made worship – I mean the worship of idolaters – over the exact view about God? Do you really think you have made the right decision rather than actually submitting to the most extremely bad view of all?"

And if he wants to know the truest reason why we have given up the doctrines of the Greeks[31] and hold those of the Hebrews in high regard,
[100] we reply with his own words. For he said the following:

Julian

2.11 *Greeks, therefore, fabricated unbelievable and fabulous myths about the gods.*[32] *For they said Cronus devoured his children and then again vomited them back up. And [they also talked about] marriages that are now against the law. For Zeus had sex with his mother, and, having begotten children by her,*
[101] *he married his own daughter, or rather he did not marry his daughter but*

[27] Gk.: τὰ Ἑβραίων ἤγουν τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [28] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [29] Gk.: τὰ Ἑλλήνων.
[30] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [31] Gk.: τὰ Ἑλλήνων.
[32] On Julian's view of myths, see his *ad deor. matr.* 10.169d–170c; *c. Her.*, as well as *c. Gal.* frs. 13.12–14; 15.2–4; 17.10–12; 23.4–37 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.1.22–24; 3.20.4–6; 3.29.16–17; 4.29.6–43) and *c. Iul.* 4.1.21 with note; cf. variously Cook 2004, 264–67; Bouffartigue 1992, 574–77 and 616–25; Boulnois 2008a; Athanassiadi 2009, 66–70; Liebeschuetz 2012; Nesselrath 2020a, especially 43–47; Niccolai 2023, 155–64.

simply had sex with her and then gave her over to another. Then [there is] the tearing apart of Dionysus and the reattachment of his limbs.[33]

Cyril

These are the kinds of stories they call the "*myths*" of the Greeks.[34] In these words you have a defense from us that should suffice! Why, then, are you so stirred up and think it is right to prosecute us for kicking away such shameful, unbelievable, and pointless myths of the Greeks and awarding the better verdict to the stories that are true? For the divine Moses and, in addition, the chorus of the holy prophets, along with the apostles and evangelists, glorify the one true God by nature and persuade us to hold the same conviction as well, guiding us away from the myths and every fable and shameful mindset, and also attuning us to an admirable way of life. And nothing in their writings has been fabricated, nor does anything in them require an implausible explanation of the ideas involved. For, when the time is right, our treatise will clearly demonstrate that our tradition corresponds to the proclamations of Moses and the holy prophets, and that the import of the evangelical and apostolic teaching agrees with the notions of those who [102] came before them.

2.12 Since he obstinately maintains that there is among us "*not one thing that is worthy of attention* or good" – I do not know what he has in mind – come now and let him prove it. For he should not make a mere unfounded denunciation. How is there "*not one thing worthy of attention*" among us? Isn't the account of God and of the world's creation found among the Christians exact and sharpened?[35] Have we not been abundantly furnished from our sacred writings with irreproachable and blameless knowledge of how one should live? Indeed, is it not clear to everyone that the best philosophical life can be conducted correctly, so it seems to me, in no other way? For philosophy that is contemplative as well as

[33] *c. Gal.* fr. 4 Mas.; Wright 1923, 324–25. Although Cyril usually seems to quote fragments from Julian's treatise in sequence, the above passage is probably cited out of order, since it has nothing in common with the other passages he cites in book 2. His reason for introducing the passage at this point is no doubt because it serves as an effective reply to Julian's query about why Christians have abandoned Hellenism. Cf. Boulnois 2011b, 805.

[34] In Burguière and Évieux, SC 322, 228 this sentence is included as the final sentence of the fragment from Julian. We follow Masaracchia and the GCS edition in viewing it as the first line of Cyril's response to the fragment.

[35] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένος. This verb can mean "to polish" or "to scrape to a point" and is one of Cyril's favorite metaphors. Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.16.28; 4.44.18; 5.8.9; 7.30.18; 8.27.3; 10.6.19; 10.24.16.

practical would receive praise from everyone and is admired by those who are zealous for the things of the Greeks.[36]

Therefore, we have not learned "*atheism*" from the view of the Hebrews – for he said this too – but, if one wants to tell the truth, we have on the basis of the God-breathed scripture condemned the Greeks for being ignorant. How would it not be evident to everyone that "*atheism*" is something present instead among those who do not know the one who alone is truly God by nature?

He also says that we have chosen "*a debased and lax manner of life from the apathy*" that exists among them, calling the Greek practice of indis-
[103] criminately eating delicacies and abstaining from nothing that is edible "*vulgarity and apathy*."[37] For they reduce the meaning of piety to this above all and suppose that they have gained perfect possession of every virtue if they but abstain from certain edible things.[38]

2.13 Yet why on earth do they define a pure way of life in these terms? For, on the one hand, everything has come from God and what comes from someone who is good is certainly honorable. And the one who is all-pure and undefiled would not have produced anything that would, in the normal course of things, defile us. For what effect could food even produce in those who partake of it or what sort of defilement could it introduce within them? On the other hand, it seems to me that it is appropriate to prohibit those things that would reasonably defile someone, and the habits of vice would accomplish this very effectively: acts of adultery, fornication, slander, speaking falsely, calumny, avarice and the rest.[39]

And, as for those people who are not concerned about any of these things, while they make a pretense of eating only a little and sometimes even exclude some edible things outright, they are afraid of nothing that is immoral. In addition, they gladden Zeus the Highest by choosing to honor his actions and they pay homage to the sovereignty of the one born on Cyprus.[40]

[36] For the division of philosophy into "contemplative" and "practical" branches, see *c. Iul.* 1.17.15–17; 2.6.6–7; with our notes *ad locc.*

[37] Although dietary customs are not mentioned in *c. Gal.* fr. 3, to which Cyril here alludes, Julian revisits this point in *c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.28), claiming that the laxity Christians display in their eating habits is something they picked up from the Greeks. Cyril probably has in mind that later passage here. See also *c. Gal.* fr. 74 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.32), which also discusses dietary practices. Cyril will respond at length in *c. Iul.* 7.32–36; 9.33–38.

[38] Cyril could have Porphyry in mind: in *On Abstinence*, he had connected holiness with philosophic behavior, including vegetarian practices: "For if in particular cases some people abstain in piety from some foods [τινων], the person who is pious in all cases will abstain from all" (*Abst.* 4.18.10, trans. Clark 2000).

[39] Cf. Matt 15:10–20; Mark 7:15–23.

[40] i.e., Aphrodite. Cf. Clement, *Prot.* 2.14.

Now there are a great many arguments thrown against us by that man, but he especially brings baseless criticisms of the all-wise Moses and [104] makes a not insignificant accusation against his treatise. For Julian claims that in composing his book about the creation of the world, "*Moses said absolutely nothing that is true, but simply heaped up a jumble of antiquated nonsense. As for those topics that one would reasonably regard as most important, he took no account of any of them. And while simply reciting lines of verse*[41] *randomly, he gave the impression of saying something wise and worth hearing*."[42] Julian has, furthermore, marveled at the views on this topic held by the Greek wise men, and above all he awards the crown to Plato's view with acclamation and applause.

2.14 He, moreover, conducts himself with no small amount of pretension, though I will refrain from discussing it again at this point. I will, however, attempt to argue, as far as I am able, that his superciliousness with respect to the Greeks' ingenuity with words is too hasty. It is neces- [105] sary, I think, once more to draw upon their own books and set forth the view that each of them thought fit to hold concerning the formation of the world, and then to offer Moses' creation account as an alternative.[43] For in this way readers will see both the nonsense of their quibbling[44] as well as the unmixed truth of Moses' writings.

So then, Plutarch, who was no insignificant man among the Greeks, in the second book of his *Collection of Physical Doctrines*, says the following about the cosmos:

> Pythagoras first named the container of all things "cosmos" in light of the order within it.[45] Thales and those who followed him say that the cosmos is one. Democritus, Epicurus, and his teacher Metrodorus say that there are infinite cosmoses in an infinite space throughout the entire surrounding area. Empedocles says that the circuit of the sun is the circumference of the cosmos' boundary. Seleucus says that the cosmos is

[41] Literally, "he simply was a rhapsode" (ἐρραψῳδηκότα).

[42] The words in italics are *c. Gal.* fr. 5 Mas., though, as Riedweg notes in the apparatus, Cyril may be paraphrasing rather than reproducing Julian's own words verbatim.

[43] Note that Cyril will deftly allow Julian himself to set forth the promised presentation of Moses' creation account by quoting *c. Gal.* fr. 6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.18–19) after he completes his survey of the cosmological views of the Greeks in 2.14–17. On Cyril's interpretation of the Genesis creation narrative that follows here, as well as in his two early exegetical works on the Pentateuch, see Villani 2022.

[44] Gk.: στενολεσχίας. This rare word might be an allusion to the phrase "quibbling (στενολεσχεῖν) about smoke" in the parody of Socrates in Aristophanes, *Nu.* 320.

[45] The word κόσμος in Greek means "order, good order, behavior" and even "ornament, decoration," and it came eventually to be applied to the regulated order of nature and the heavens, in the sense of "universe" or "world." According to Cyril's source, Pythagoras was the first to use the term in this sense.

> infinite. Diogenes says that while the All is infinite, the cosmos is limited. The Stoics say the All and the universe are different. For the All includes the infinite void but the universe is the cosmos separate from the void, with the result that the universe and the cosmos are the same thing.[46]

2.15 Next, concerning the shape of the cosmos he once more says the following:

[106]

> The Stoics say the cosmos is spherical, but others say conical, and others egg-shaped. Epicurus says it is possible that the cosmoses are spherical, but it is also possible that they take on other shapes as well.[47]

And again, in setting forth an explanation of the views of the Greek philosophers on the question of whether or not the cosmos is ensouled, he said the following:

> All the others say the cosmos is ensouled and managed by providence, but Democritus, Epicurus, and those who introduced atoms and the void say it is neither ensouled nor managed by providence, but by an irrational nature. Aristotle says the universe is neither ensouled throughout nor is it rational or intelligent, nor is it managed by providence. For he says the celestial bodies partake of all these qualities – since they contain ensouled and living spheres – while earthly things partake of none of them but participate in good order accidentally and not by design.[48]

So much for these topics. Now since their aim was also to examine closely whether or not the cosmos was ever naturally corruptible, they set forth the following views on this question as well:

> Pythagoras, <Plato,>[49] and the Stoics say the cosmos is generated by God and, as far as its nature is concerned, is corruptible – for it is perceptible

[46] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 2.1. Cyril is citing under the name of Plutarch an epitome of a doxographical treatise originally titled the *Placita* and composed by an otherwise unknown Aetius in the first or second century AD. The passage above is the entirety of the first chapter of the second book in the epitomized version, bearing the title "Concerning the Cosmos" (Περὶ κόσμου). Aetius's *Placita*, whether in its original or epitomized form, was also an important source for Eusebius, *P.e.*; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.*; Nemesius, *Nat. hom.*; Theodoret, *Affect.* Cf. Runia 2023, who discusses Cyril on pp.214–19. Aetius' work does not survive through direct transmission and must be reconstructed on the basis of those authors, like Cyril, who quoted it, though the epitome by Ps-Plutarch has been passed down mostly intact in Greek and a complete version survives in Arabic. See the new edition in Mansfeld and Runia 2020. On Cyril's abbreviated version of the title of Ps-Plutarch's epitome, see Mansfeld and Runia 2020, 3 n. 3.

[47] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 2.2. In introducing this quotation, Cyril uses Ps-Plutarch's chapter title "Concerning the Shape of the Cosmos."

[48] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 2.3. Again, in introducing this passage Cyril picks up part of the chapter title "Whether the Cosmos Is Ensouled and Managed by Providence." A portion of this passage had previously been cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 15.34.

[49] The phrase καὶ Πλάτων is supplied from the quotation of this passage in Eusebius, *P.e.* 15.35.

by sense because it is also corporeal – but will not be destroyed thanks to the providence and maintenance of God. Epicurus says it is corruptible, because it is generated, like a living creature, like a plant. Xenophanes says the cosmos is ungenerated, eternal and incorruptible. Aristotle says the [107]
part of the cosmos that is under the moon is subject to change, the part in which also the things on earth play out.[50]

2.16 Listen, O men, and at last understand[51] what a great load of nonsense there is in these comments! For when they rise up against one another's views and thoughtlessly blurt out this or that idea in complete and utter confusion, in accord with whatever seems right to each of them, should they not be regarded as people who are randomly guessing rather than being experts in the truth?[52] For some say the cosmos is one while others say it is many. Some say it is generated while there are others who are entirely opposed to them and hold different opinions, saying it is incorruptible and ungenerated. Furthermore, some say it is managed by God's providence, while others in turn say it is managed without providence, and assign the orderly motion of the elements to chance and accidental events. And some say it is ensouled while others say it is neither ensouled nor intellectual. All in all, anyone can see that their account about each topic staggers about here and there like someone who has had too much to drink.

And since Julian has singled Plato out from the others and dwells above all on his views, I would concede that both Plato and Pythagoras to a degree manage to form their views about God and the cosmos in a more reasonable fashion. But they had gathered instruction, or rather knowledge, about this due to spending time with the Egyptians, who held the all-wise Moses in high regard and honored the marvelous quality [108]
of his doctrines.[53]

Nevertheless, they say that Plato himself held views that were self-contradictory and that Aristotle, who attended his school, chose not to follow his ideas, but took a stand against him and advanced views opposed to Plato's. For Porphyry says Plato expressed a view about heaven and said that its corporeal form was composed out of the four elements, which the soul has united with one another in harmony.[54] "It

[50] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 2.4, a chapter titled "Whether the Cosmos Is Corruptible." This passage had previously been cited in Eusebius, *Pe.* 15.35.

[51] Cf. Matt 15:10. [52] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.39.9–11. [53] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.18–19.

[54] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 31b–33a (which describes the Creator's use of the four elements in crafting the cosmos, though not heaven as such) and 36de (which describes the soul's interweaving with the body of the cosmos).

was for this reason," he says, "that it remains at present, since it <is>[55] a mixed entity, and is named by the addition [of an upsilon]."[56] **2.17** He etymologizes its name, I think, and says it is called "heaven"[57] inasmuch as it is something visible,[58] in order that a concept of heaven might be formed on the basis of the fact that it is seen.[59] These views, however, did not seem right to Aristotle. Why? He says the heaven is not constructed nor does it consist of the four elements, but he conceives of a certain fifth body that does not participate in the four elements and is entirely without any share in them.

In addition, Plato says the cosmos is ensouled and an intelligent living creature, and he also puts providence in charge of it and defines it as generated and corruptible at least insofar as it depends on its own nature.
[109] His pupil, however, once again thought differently. For [he says] the universe is neither ensouled throughout its entirety nor intelligent nor administered by providence, and does not even grant that it is generated, instead [saying] that it is incorruptible and ungenerated.[60]

Once again, the clever and renowned Plato declares that there are three first principles of the All: God, matter, and form. God he says is the maker, matter is the substrate, and form is the pattern for each of those things that come into being. Aristotle, however, once again rises up against him and does not agree with him at all. For he does not deign to

[55] Following Segonds and Schrader, the GCS edition inserts a causal participle here to provide a Platonic explanation for the main verb μένει; i.e., it is the mixing with soul that provides perdurance to the physical cosmos.

[56] Porphyry, fr. 460 Smith. This fragment is printed in Smith's edition of Porphyry's fragments in the section containing those of uncertain location on the soul; the work from which it came could be the *Philosophical History*, book 4 (which contained discussion of Plato's metaphysics), or from his *Commentary on the Timaeus* (Porphyry had discussed Plato's account of the creation of the cosmos from the four elements at *Comm. Tim.* frs. 58–59 Sodano). Because of its brevity, it is impossible to determine how this short fragment fit within whatever larger discussion from which it came. Apparently, heaven is the subject; alternatively, the soul was described as a mixture of the Same, the Different, and Being at Plato, *Ti.* 37a, and could be the subject here. It is likewise difficult to discern the signification of the phrase κατὰ τὸ πλεονάζον, which could designate an "excess" of one element over the others; or the supreme element, i.e., fire (since the following describes the etymology of heaven from "the visible," which in *Ti.* 31b was possible because of the highest element, fire); or a "redundancy" in naming, i.e., verbal pleonasm; or an "addition" of the letter upsilon to ὁρατός ("visible") to produce οὐρανός ("heaven"). On the final option, which we follow in the above translation, see Boulnois 2020a, 462–65.

[57] Gk.: οὐρανόν. [58] Gk.: ὁρατόν.

[59] Gk.: ὁρᾶσθαι. See Plato, *R.* 6.509d where he alludes to a link between ὁρατός and οὐρανός. At *Cra.* 396bc Plato also proposes an etymological link between οὐράνιος and ὁράω.

[60] Cyril's attempt to drive a wedge between Plato's and Aristotle's views of providence stands in contrast with his contemporary, Hierocles, a Neoplatonist philosopher who taught in Alexandria. In his work *On Providence*, which survives only in testimonia and extracts from Photius, Hierocles sought to show the agreement of Plato and Aristotle on this important question. Cf. Hierocles, *Prov.* 214.2.171b–172a; 214.8.173a; 251.3.461a.

think or say that form is a first principle, but says there are two first principles, God and matter.[61]

Once more Plato, after saying that there are three first principles of the universe (God, matter, and form), actually adds a fourth one as well, which he calls the "universal soul." In addition to this, though he says matter is ungenerated, he also claims it is generated. Next, having granted that form, whatever it is, subsists on its own, he then contradicts his own inventions. For he said that it exists in the thoughts of God and does not have its own existence or ability to become a substance.[62]

2.18 To whom, then, should those searching for the truth give their assent that they might rush down the blameless and most unerring path? Which of the aforementioned persons should we say was innocent of false speech? To whom would it be right to award the verdict of not having been mistaken in any respect? Or rather how could people who [110] have missed the truth by so much that they oppose not only one another but even their very own views be fit for the task of persuading any others?

But the all-wise Julian praises and stands in awe of these views. He mocks Moses' books[63] and, turning everything upside down, dares to compare them to the words of Plato, saying,

Julian

At this point allow us, if you will, to bring up Plato's statement for the sake of comparison. Observe, then, what he says about the Craftsman and what words he attributes to him in his cosmogony, in order that we may set alongside one another Plato's cosmogony and Moses'. For in this way it will become apparent who is the better and who is more worthy of God, Plato who "served idols"[64] *or the one about whom the scripture says God spoke to him "mouth to mouth."*[65]

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss. And the Spirit of God was moving over the water. And God said, 'Let there be light,' and light [111] *came into existence. And God saw that the light was good. And God made a separation between the light and the dark, and God called the light 'day,' and the dark he called 'night.' And evening came and morning came – day one.*

[61] This paragraph is a paraphrase of Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 6.1. On Aristotle's rejection of Plato's doctrine of the forms, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.45.1–6.

[62] This paragraph is a paraphrase of Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 7.1.

[63] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως.

[64] This phrase is in scare quotes to indicate that it does not represent Julian's own view. Rather, he is sarcastically taking on the description of Plato he imagines his Christian opponents will have. Compare this with *c. Gal.* fr. 20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46), where Julian uses the same phrase and qualifies it with "as you say": τοῖς εἰδώλοις, ὥς φατε, λατρεύοντας.

[65] Num 12:8. Cf. Exod 33:11.

And God said, 'Let there be a firmament in the midst of the water […]*.'* […] *And God called the firmament 'heaven'* […]*. And God said, 'Let the water below the heaven be gathered into one gathering, and let the dry land appear.' And thus it came into existence* […]*. And God said, 'Let the earth sprout forth grass for fodder* […] *and a fruit-bearing tree* […]*.'* […] *And God said, 'Let there be luminaries in the firmament of the heaven, in order that they might serve as light upon the earth* […]*.'* […] *And God placed them in the firmament of the heaven in order to rule the day and the night.'*[66]

2.19 *In this passage he says neither that the abyss was created by God, nor the darkness nor the water. Yet, given that he said the light came to exist when God commanded, surely he should also have said the same thing about the night and the abyss and the water. But he said nothing at all about them that implies they have come into being, even though he frequently made mention of them.*

In addition, he mentioned neither the origin or creation of angels, nor in what manner they were brought forth, but only the dwellings round about the
[112] *heaven and the earth, with the result that God, according to Moses, is the maker of not a single incorporeal thing but is the one who sets in order the material substrate. For the sentence "And the earth was invisible and unformed" can only mean that he regards the watery substance as matter and introduces God as the one who sets it in order.*[67]

Cyril

Now as for Moses, if one chose to speak in acclamation of him, it would be possible to go on at great length. For he heard God clearly saying, "I know you among all people and you have found favor before me."[68] As an exceptionally clear proof of the manifold virtue abiding within him, consider his ability to perform miracles in Egypt. For he submitted himself to the God of the universe and was an assistant to him as he
[113] made his creation rise up in rebellion against the Egyptians' mad ideas.

But as for what sort of person Plato was, even if there was no one who could speak to this question, his departure from Athens to go to Sicily would say it loud and clear. For they say that Dionysius, unsatisfied with the flattery he received from Plato, sold him, inflicting upon him a

[66] Aside from the omissions noted by ellipses above, this is an accurate quotation of Gen 1:1–18. The Mosaic cosmogony had been previously subjected to criticism by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 6.49–63).

[67] *c. Gal.* fr. 6 Mas.; Wright 1923, 328–33.

[68] Cyril's quotation here matches no LXX verse exactly but is close to Exod 33:12 and 33:17. He cited this peculiar version of the passage on multiple occasions. Cf. *Jo.* 1:17; 6:8–10; 10:14–15 (1.150; 1.413; 2.231 Pusey); *Glaph. Ex.* 3; *Num.* (PG 69.497c; 597b); *Hom. Lc.* 13:25 (PG 72.777c); *Ep. Fest.* 2.2.

penalty best suited to a slave, as if he were, perhaps, in no sense a free man.[69] Nevertheless, let the discussion about this topic be set aside for now so that we can return once more to the matter at hand.

2.20 For we see that the divine Moses has neither composed random words nor was he motivated to write by mere ambition but rather because he had in mind something essential for the edification of one's life. For he certainly did not intend to give a subtle discourse on physics or to say something about the so-called "first principles" or about the elements derived from them – for these topics are, in my opinion, overly technical and cannot be grasped by the reasoning capacity some people possess. His purpose instead was to focus the minds of his contemporaries upon the doctrines of the truth. [114]

For they had been led astray and were caught worshipping whatever pleased each of them, and, due to their extreme ignorance, they were unaware of the one true God by nature and "worshipped the creation."[70] So some entitled the heaven "God," others the sun's circuit, while there are yet others who were eager to assign the glory of the most supreme nature to the moon, the stars, the earth, the plants, and to the nature of water and to birds and irrational animals. Since human affairs had reached such a state and since such a terrible disease had overrun everyone on earth, Moses came to their rescue and was revealed as an instructor who introduced the noblest of lessons to everyone: on the one hand, he explicitly cried out that the Craftsman of the universe is one by nature, and, on the other hand, he distinguished him from everything else that was brought into being and existence entirely through him.

Hence, with an acute sense of what was most needed, Moses very wisely did not pause to engage in excessively subtle disputation and so moved on to an account of more essential matters. **2.21** For why would it have been necessary for him to say what sort of nature the waters have or how it came to be in the first place, or why would it have been necessary for him to probe the abyss or the nature of heaven or to busy himself[71] with the mode of the angels' existence? For I imagine there is agreement on the fact that everyone would find these topics difficult to explain. But even if it might have in fact been possible for him to articulate such matters clearly, with God granting him wisdom, who would have listened

[69] Cf. Diodorus Siculus 15.7. Plato's humiliation as a slave was also mentioned in Heraclitus, *All.* 78.6; Tatian, *Or.* 2.1; Diogenes Laertius 3.19; Gregory Nazianzus, *Or.* 4.72; Theodoret, *Affect.* 12.71.

[70] Rom 1:25.

[71] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῆσαι; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

to him or been able to understand such subtle ideas, or rather ideas that
[115] even surpass human intelligence?[72]

And yet we will discover that those who lived at the time when the book of the all-wise Moses was composed had fallen even further behind the very ignorance of the Greeks. For they can be apprehended as having stumbled into the pit of the most extreme kind of stupidity of all due to precisely those factors that should have enabled the clear discernment of the glory of God. For as the God-breathed scripture says, those who lived in ancient times doubtless had to reflect upon the Craftsman and designer of the universe on the basis of the beauty of created things.[73] Nevertheless they were departing into such an ill-advised course of action that even those very things that would reasonably have brought them to a knowledge of the truth instead became the very means by which they were caught suffering an addiction to falsehood. The all-wise Paul would also be a faithful witness of this fact, since he has written as follows: "For since the creation of the world, his invisible attributes, namely his eternal power and divinity, are clearly visible, apprehended in the things that have been made, with the result that they are without excuse. For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give him thanks but became futile in their thinking and their foolish hearts were
[116] darkened."[74]

2.22 Now this passage would be a fitting description of those people who have invented that false worship that belongs to the herd and the rabble[75] and is entirely irrational, the sort of people who were, as I said, the intended audience of the all-wise Moses' book. But if we busy ourselves[76] with the view of those who came after them, we will easily see that they can be caught *in flagrante* infected with a madness that has reached its fullest extent. For Plutarch, that exceptionally subtle man, spoke about this at one point in the first book of his *Collection of Physical Doctrines*:

> But they received[77] a conception of God from this. For the sun, moon, and the rest of the stars, after being carried along under the earth,

[72] The Bible's ability to communicate to not only the educated elite capable of understanding higher truths but also the multitude was also emphasized in Origen, *Cels.* 1.18; 4.50.

[73] Cyril's phrasing here alludes to Wis 13:1–5. [74] Rom 1:20–21.

[75] Julian on one occasion used the same description, presenting himself as not belonging to "the herd or the rabble" (οὐδὲ τῶν ἀγελαίων οὐδὲ τῶν συρφετῶν) but instead to the "reasonable and restrained class" (*ad Ath.* 6.356c).

[76] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσαντες; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[77] While the text of Ps-Plutarch has ἐλάβομεν ("we received"), Cyril's version reads ἔλαβον ("they received"), possibly reflecting a change he himself made.

> always rise with the same colors, equal to their sizes and in the same positions.[78]

And once more in the same book, he said,

> They define their conception of God in the following way: an intelligent and fiery spirit, without any form, that changes into whatever it wishes and assimilates itself to all things. And they first received a conception of this being from the beauty of what is visible, applying the idea that nothing beautiful could come into existence randomly or by chance, but [only] with the aid of some artistry that crafts it.[79] [117]

I will add to these things what was at one point written by Hermes Thrice-Greatest in his work *To His Own Mind* (for so the book is named):

> Then do you say, "God is invisible"? Hold your tongue! Who is more visible than him? This is the reason he made everything, in order that through everything one might see him. This is God's goodness and this his virtue, that he be made manifest through everything.[80]

2.23 And we will observe that even Julian himself who denounces our pure worship agrees with these comments. For he maintains emphatically that to know God is a matter that cannot be taught, that it is something humans learn for themselves.[81] For he speaks as follows:

[78] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.6, 879–80. Cyril will quote this passage again below at *c. Iul.* 2.52.21–24. Although his manner of introducing the passage here seems to be including Plutarch among those who were "infected with a madness that has reached its fullest extent," he later cites the passage to agree with it, positioning Plutarch as one who does not worship the heaven but the God who made it. It seems probable that here too he quotes the passage to agree with Plutarch, using him as a foil for those who worship created things, but has not clearly marked for the reader the abrupt change of focus. Note that after citing Plutarch, Hermes, and indeed Julian as evidence of a superior way of forming one's view of God (= *c. Iul.* 2.22.7–2.23.26), he returns to those who were misled into worshipping creation at *c. Iul.* 2.24.1.

[79] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.6, 879c. Though Cyril does not acknowledge it, this passage in Ps-Plutarch is specifically about the Stoics. Either Cyril or his source has omitted the subject of the sentence (οἱ Στωικοί), making it a general statement. Cyril has excerpted this and the previous passage from the same chapter of Ps-Plutarch's epitome but has reversed their sequence. Moreover, both passages are about how humanity arrives at a "conception of God" (ἔννοια θεοῦ), the same topic Julian himself announced at *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.1–2).

[80] *Corp.Herm.* 11.22. Unlike the Hermetic fragments in book 1, this is the first Hermetic passage quoted by Cyril that also survives in the manuscript tradition. In the manuscript tradition it bears the title "Mind, to Hermes" (Νοῦς πρὸς Ἑρμῆν) (1.147 Nock and Festugière; trans. Copenhaver 1992, 37), which differs from the title Cyril gives ("To his own Mind") (Πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν).

[81] Cf. Cyril's own claims at *c. Iul.* 3.48.21–22; 4.35.20–23; 5.3.21–23; also the opening line of Athanasius' *Contra Gentes*: "Knowledge of religion and of the truth about the universe does not so much need instruction from people as it can be acquired by itself" (*Gent.* 1.1–3; trans. Thomson 1971, modified). Athanasius expands on this point at *Gent.* 30f.

Julian

> *Let our first proof of the fact that [the idea of God][82] is not taught but naturally belongs to human beings be the common desire for the divine that all people have, both publicly and privately, at the level of individuals as well as entire nations. For without being taught, everyone believes in something that*
> [118] *is divine. Yet beyond this, it is not easy for everyone <to have> precise <knowledge>, nor is it possible for those who do know to communicate it to everyone.*[83]

And after other things he once more says,

> *In addition to this common conception that all people have there is also another. For all of us humans are naturally so attached to heaven and the gods apparent in it that even if someone did imagine another God besides those ones, he without exception assigned heaven to him as a dwelling place, not separating him from the earth, but, so to speak, seating him as the emperor of the universe in that most honorable place of all, and imagining that from that place he gazes upon what goes on here below.*[84]

Cyril

Observe, then, that there were some who did not tolerate the thick-headed, fraudulent, and, if I may say so, vulgar error and abandoned the view of the common herd; they were thus not entirely devoid of the true conception of God but deduced that the transcendent magnitude of his innate power must be so great that it subjected even such a vast and marvelous creation to orderly laws.

2.24 The others, however, about whom this passage speaks,[85] did not even know God through the created things. For they instead became so stupefied and so far removed from a properly human way of thinking, that they not only chose to worship the heaven and earth and moon and
[119] the other stars, but also placed in sacred precincts seated statues of diverse forms and engraved upon them not only human forms but also those of irrational animals and birds and reptiles, and these they addressed as gods and saviors.

[82] Julian's fragment here has τοῦτο ("this") but presumably it refers to the "conception of God" mentioned in *c. Gal.* fr. 3.1–2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.1–2).

[83] This last sentence draws on the tradition of divine incomprehensibility and ineffability expressed in Plato, *Ti.* 28c. See also the similar statement at Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 3.131d. Cyril has already cited this passage at *c. Iul.* 1.42.12–14.

[84] *c. Gal.* fr. 7 Mas.; Wright 1923, 320–23.

[85] The passage Cyril has in mind is presumably Rom 1:20–21, which he cited above at *c. Iul.* 2.22.21–24.

How then could someone not admire the Mosaic art of saying nothing technical or deep and nothing that was difficult for people at that time to receive, but instead telling them what was needed to empower them to transition to a correct state and able to steer them to a blameless view, I mean a view of God as the ruler over all things?[86] Now someone would quite reasonably commend the teachers of schoolchildren who accommodate themselves to the intellectual ability of their students and little by little lead them by the hand so that they gain the ability to know some aspect of ineffable realities, offering at the beginning nothing that requires a great deal of training or a steep uphill climb. Should we then not regard the most sacred Moses as worthy of all praise when he did the same?

But if it seems to you that Moses said nothing about the topics that are essential, would you like us to touch upon those lessons dearest to you? Let us busy ourselves,[87] as far as possible, with the precise details of Hesiod's *Theogony*. **2.25** For he pretends to speak with God's voice, and, [120] giving himself the appearance of one inspired by the Muses, as though that were something great and desirable, he says,

> Tell me how, at the beginning, gods and earth came to be
> And rivers and the boundless sea seething with swell,
> Shining stars and far-reaching Heaven above.[88]

Next, after saying that Chaos and Night came to be, though without specifying how this happened,[89] he says,

> Earth first brought forth, equal to herself,
> Starry Heaven to cover her all around,[90]

and, after declaring that Heaven is Earth's child, [he says] she also bore seas, and "laying with Heaven [she bore] Coeus and Oceanus and Hyperion and Iapetus and Theia and Rhea and Themis and Mnemosyne," and, in addition to these, Phoebe, whom he names "golden-crowned," and, of course, also "lovely Tethys." Moreover, he says [121] Cronus was born as "the youngest" of them all.[91] He then adds a sort of mishmash of pointless and incoherent stories.

[86] Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 4.53.
[87] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσωμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[88] Hesiod, *Th.* 108–10.
[89] In this passing remark Cyril turns against Hesiod the criticism Julian had levelled at Moses at *c. Gal.* fr. 6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.18–19).
[90] Hesiod, *Th.* 126–27. [91] Hesiod, *Th.* 133–37.

Perhaps, however, Julian will call Hesiod's fabrication of these myths poetic license.[92] For it may be that he blushes at Hesiod's stories. If so, then why is he accusing the hierophant Moses, who has composed such a clear and completely inerrant book containing true stories? For he said God made both the heaven and the earth, both sun and moon, stars and light, birds and swimming things and species of irrational animals, as well as beautiful plants, edible fruits, and the herbs of the fields.

2.26 And observe how with these words Moses, with great wisdom, shears off the error that had fallen upon the ancients. For do they not name the heaven "Zeus," the earth Demeter," the sun "Apollo," the moon "the noisy goddess with the golden arrows," that is Artemis, and the wet substance "Poseidon"? In summary, they bestowed on each of those things made by God whatever name seemed best and worshipped them as gods.[93]

Furthermore, allow us, if you please, to show clearly that the divine Moses' account of the cosmogony is clear and easily understood, having nothing technical, and was even made with great accuracy. For he says,
[122] "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."[94] So he rules out entirely the view that matter is without a beginning and coeternal with God and, as some say, ungenerated; or the view that what at one time did not exist is concurrent and cosubsistent with the one who always exists; or that what has only just been brought into existence in time is cosubsistent with the one who is eternal; or that what has been put into motion is cosubsistent with the one who is invariably in the same state; or that what is subject to corruption is cosubsistent with the one who is incorruptible. Rather, he circumscribes the creation by time and by a first principle that calls it into existence, as though brought by the will of God from nonbeing into being exactly what it is. And surely he does not say that, with matter existing in advance as a substrate waiting to be discovered, God was simply a designer who set it in order, endowing that which was formless with form in a way only he can understand, and that all he did was to apply to it different qualities as well as magnitudes and masses. No, what he said was that by a certain ineffable

[92] Gk.: τὸν ποιητοῦ *νόμον*. The same claim is considered in Athanasius, *Gent*. 16. See also Cyril, *c. Iul.* 2.35.1–6; 3.3.1–6; 3.20.37–38; 5.32.1–2. On the notion of poetic license in ancient scholarship, see Nünlist 2009, 174–84. The usual phrase used in antiquity to refer to "poetic license" was ποιητικὴ ἄδεια or ἐξουσία. Cyril typically refers to the poet's *νόμος* and seems to have in mind a similar notion.

[93] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.36, where Cyril claims that Homer used the gods to represent various elements.

[94] Gen 1:1.

and indescribable power he brought that which previously neither existed nor had any being at all to the initial moment of its existence. [123]

2.27 As for the manner by which he creates, it cannot be comprehended by our intellect, and is even, in my view, beyond all telling. For how could someone explain matters that surpass the intellect? The creative inventions of the substance above all substances and the path towards anything whatsoever that needs doing will, I think, surpass our capacities to the same degree that we are also inferior to it with respect to nature.

Hence, when Moses says, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,"[95] you should realize that he narrates the generation of the entire creation in summary fashion as though he were gathering everything together into a few words. He then skillfully proceeds to the needed description of how they were ordered[96] and how each of those things created was exceedingly well allotted to be exactly what it is. Furthermore, he says that it was by his all-powerful Word that he has crafted all things. For the Craftsman of the universe, his Word, is God and from God according to nature. For Moses states, "God said, 'Let a firmament come into existence,'"[97] and observe, please, that the firmament, which he also calls "heaven,"[98] was immediately established by the power of the Word. God said, "let the dry ground appear," and the water ran together "into [124] one gathering."[99] In addition, God also said, "Let the sun come into existence," and it did so, along with the moon and stars and light and animals, those living on land and in water and also the birds.

Moreover, Moses taught that even the very nature of the elements would not have had the ability to escape from corruption on its own or from itself but instead requires the hand of the one who sustains it in its appropriate state, as one can see when he says, "The Spirit of God was moving over the water."[100] For the Spirit of God gives life to everything and is itself also life by nature, coming as it does from the life of the Father. Everything stands in need of it and would not otherwise experience the stability of continuing to be that which it is.

2.28 Observe, therefore, that it was by the Word, as I said, that the firmament was established and that the dry land emerged as the waters were gathered together into one place. Observe the land sprouting forth both grasses and trees with their generative principles[101] so that through

[95] Gen 1:1.
[96] The phrase "how they were ordered" is a proleptic allusion to Julian's own reference to the *Genesis* account in *c. Gal.* fr. 18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33).
[97] Gen 1:6. [98] Gen 1:8. [99] Gen 1:9. [100] Gen 1:2.
[101] Gk.: σπερματικοὺς … λόγους. Cf. Gen 1:11–12.

[125] them such ephemeral realities might persist and be preserved, stealing the power of eternal existence. Consider the "luminaries in the firmament" being brought into existence by God not for any other purpose than solely that they would "give light" to those "on the earth," and demarcate the "seasons and days and years."[102] Moreover, Moses says the land too was commanded to put forth the nature of irrational animals, as the Craftsman distributes a form for each of them, along with its size and the exact purpose for which it would be brought into existence.[103]

Furthermore, once everything else in the world had finally been created and not a single one of those things needed by humans was lacking, then and only then did the Craftsman reflect upon the manner in which humans also should exist. For the generation of humanity did not in fact occur extemporaneously as happened with the other creatures. But since the supreme nature is thought to be, and in fact is, grand and remarkable, or rather beyond all thought and speech and marvel, it decided to make an animal similar to itself, insofar as was possible. This is why, to avoid giving the impression that the animal about to exist as its image and likeness[104] (the human that is) is something unimportant and despised or even that it differs little from the other animals, it quite reasonably regarded the generation of humanity as something that should not be undertaken without prior reflection.[105] **2.29** Yet someone might say – and they would be not far from the truth – that nothing could escape the notice of the divine intellect. He knows, indeed he knows, "all things before their generation."[106] What, then, was he reflecting upon, when he already was aware of human nature in advance? It is, as I said,[107] by way
[126] of accommodation[108] that the most excellent Moses says humanity has somehow, so to speak, been honored with prior deliberation, not introducing what one might call a simple generation, varying in no way from the others, but rather with God, so to speak, rolling the matter over in his mind. It is a hyperbolic account, but one that, in my view, seems to be well made, if we agree that humanity is the best of the animals on earth and has even been made according to the image of the Creator.

[102] Gen 1:14–17. The phrase "not for any other purpose" is perhaps an implicit critique of astral determinism or may allude to Julian's assumption that the heavenly bodies were "dwellings" for divine beings (see *c. Gal.* fr. 6.33 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.19.9]).

[103] Cf. Gen 1:24–25. [104] Cf. Gen 1:26.

[105] In this paragraph Cyril highlights a distinction in the *Genesis* creation account. Only for the creation of humanity did God deliberate with himself prior to the act of creating (cf. Gen 1:26), making it seem as though for all the rest of creation he was simply "extemporizing" (ἀπεσχεδιάζετο) "without prior reflection" (ἀκατάσκεπτον). Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.29.15–24; 1.33.6; 10.32.29–33.

[106] Sus 42. [107] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.29. [108] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς.

That the entire creation has been brought into existence by God's supremely powerful beckoning is easily learned also – at least in my view – from what the teachers of Julian's superstition have written. For it seemed right to all of them to think and to say that everything without distinction has been crafted by him, realities both intelligible and sensible, invisible and visible. For they have agreed that "all things are around the king" and lord "of all."[109] And in fact Plato even goes so far as to say "Gods of gods! Those works of which I am the Craftsman and Father."[110]

Now we have already introduced the quotations of the Greeks – I mean those that related to this topic[111] – and I will refrain from repeating myself but will make mention of the discourses of Hermes the Thrice-Greatest. **2.30** For he said the following in his discourse to Asclepius: [127]

> Osiris, he says, spoke: "Then, O greatest Agathos Daemon, how did the whole earth appear?" And the great Agathos Daemon said, "It was in an orderly fashion by a process of drying up, as I said. When the abundant waters were ordered by the Lord to withdraw into themselves, the whole earth appeared, muddy and trembling. Finally, when the sun flared up and started continuously heating and drying it, the earth surrounded by water began to solidify amidst the waters."[112]

In addition, somewhere else he says,

> The Craftsman and Lord of all spoke, "Let the earth exist and the firmament appear," and immediately earth came into being as the beginning of his creation.[113]

So much for the earth. About the sun Hermes once more says the following:

> And Osiris said, "O Thrice-Greatest Agathos Daemon, where did this great sun come from?" And the great Agathos Daemon said, "Osiris, do you want us to declare the sun's birth and the source of its appearance? It appeared by the providence of the master of all. The sun's origin is from the master of all and came to be by his holy and creative Word."[114] [128]

[109] A paraphrase of Plato, *Ep*. 2.312e, which was already quoted by Cyril at *c. Iul.* 1.47 within a fragment from Porphyry.

[110] Plato, *Ti*. 41a, a passage that Julian also quotes at *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas., which Cyril is about to introduce at *c. Iul.* 2.33.

[111] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.42–49.

[112] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 31 Nock and Festugière.

[113] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 32a Nock and Festugière.

[114] *Corp.Herm*. fr. 32b Nock and Festugière. Scott thought that the last sentence of this passage was not a part of the Hermetic fragment but came from Cyril instead. However, the phrase "master of all" echoes the penultimate sentence and is not typical Cyrillian diction, and creation by the divine word is affirmed elsewhere in the Hermetic corpus (cf. *Corp.Herm.* 4.1). For these reasons it is best viewed as belonging to the Hermetic fragment.

Similarly, in the first of his detailed discourses with Tat, Hermes says,

> The Lord of all immediately spoke by his own holy, intelligible, and creative Word, "Let the sun exist," and, as soon as he said it, nature by its own spirit drew to itself the fire with an ascending nature – I mean that fire that is unmixed and brightest, being more active and fecund – and it raised [the fire] on high, away from the water.[115]

2.31 Therefore, for a human it would be fitting to think and true to say that all things have been made by God's command through his creative Word, but as for how or in what way he did so, this is something he and only he would know. And the fact that, according to his prerogative, he grants to each of those things that come into existence a particular mode of being and that he is the one who determines the manner of the existence of all things would also be clear through what Moses said: "'Let the firmament exist,' … and thus it came into existence," and "'Let the water be gathered into a single gathering,' and the dry ground appeared."[116] For these statements actually define the nature of each of those things brought into existence. Hermes, who is Thrice-Greatest among the Greeks, once again makes mention of this point too. For he has introduced God as saying to the creatures, "I will bestow upon you, my
[129] subjects, this necessary commandment given to you through my Word. For this you have as a law."[117] For, as I just said, the Craftsman defined a natural law for each of those things that came into existence, and it is clear that by his beckoning [each] one happens to be – or not be – allotted a particular mode of being.

Now this is what a straightforward account free from any underhanded tricks would sound like. Julian, however, has an inordinate admiration for Plato's view and says,

Julian

> *Now as for Plato, hear what he says about the cosmos: "The whole heaven or cosmos – or if there is some other name that would be most acceptable, let us call it that – […] has it always existed, having no start to its existence, or has it come into being, beginning at some initial moment? It has come into existence. For it is visible and tangible and has a body, and all such things are susceptible to the senses, capable of being comprehended by conjecture with the aid of sensation."*[118]

[115] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 33 Nock and Festugière.
[116] Gen 1:6, 9.
[117] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 34 Nock and Festugière.
[118] Plato, *Ti.* 28bc.

And further on he says, "If[119] *[one is] in fact [following] the most probable account, then one must say this cosmos has truly come into existence as a living creature, endowed with soul and intellect, thanks to God's providence."*[120] [130]

Cyril

2.32 Observe how clearly even Plato, who Julian thinks is divine and all-wise, has affirmed that the entire cosmos – or whatever one wants to call it – was generated and began at some initial moment; is tangible, visible, and embodied; is subject to the judgment of the senses; and was made in accordance with the providence of the Craftsman.

But Julian, since he was completely hung up on Plato's ingenious argumentation and crowned it with the utmost praise, shared in his errors and did not think in a blameless manner, but was, as it were, "carried about by every wind."[121] We will make this clear without any delay by once more setting forth Julian's own words. For he said the following:

Julian

Let us simply place one alongside the other and compare them: what is the creative act performed by the God in Moses' account and what kind is it, and what kind is undertaken by the God in Plato's account? "And God said, 'Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and the cattle and all the earth and all the creeping things that creep upon the earth.' And God made humanity; according to the image of God he made them; male and female he made them. And God blessed them, saying, 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the [131] *sky and all the cattle and all the earth.'"*[122]

2.33 *Listen also, then, to Plato's speech that he attributes to the Craftsman of the universe: "Gods of gods! Those works of which I am the Craftsman and Father […] shall be indissoluble as long as I will it. Everything that is bound is soluble, but only an evil being would decide to dissolve that which is joined together well and in a good state. Therefore, inasmuch as you have come to exist, you are not immortal nor altogether indissoluble. Yet in fact you will not be dissolved nor meet the fate of death, having found in my will a bond still greater and more sovereign than those by which you were bound when you came into existence.*

[119] The received text of Plato here reads οὕτως οὖν ("Therefore thus"), while Julian's quotation (as preserved by Cyril of course) has εἰ ("If").
[120] *c. Gal.* fr. 8 Mas.; Wright 1923, 332–33. Julian's final quotation is from Plato, *Ti.* 30bc.
[121] Cf. Eph 4:14. [122] Gen 1:26–28.

> *Now then learn what I say to you by way of explanation. Three races of mortal beings still remain uncreated, and so long as they have not come into existence heaven will be incomplete. For it will not have all the kinds of living creatures in it […]. But if I were the one who brought them into existence and gave them a share in life, they would be equal to gods. Therefore, in order that they may be mortal and that this All may really be all, apply yourselves,*
> [132] *according to your nature, to the creation of living creatures, imitating the power I showed when generating you. And insofar as it is proper for them to have the same name as the immortals – that part that is called 'divine' and rules in those who always intend to follow after justice and after you – that part I myself will hand over to you, once I have sown it and granted it existence. The rest of the task is yours: by weaving together the mortal with the immortal, produce living creatures and beget them, and by giving them food cause them to grow and when they perish receive them back again."*[123]

Cyril

2.34 So then, this noble man, so audacious in his arguments against us, mocks the origin of humanity – I mean the one that was narrated through the most excellent Moses – and thinks it a trifle that God bestowed on human nature a creation according to his own image and likeness.[124] Yet would not all sensible people agree that his doing so effects one of the most beautiful adornments someone could receive? For what, pray tell, is better than to say that the divine likeness is stamped upon us? Do we not affirm that the divine substance is that which is supreme and higher than everything else, radiant with inexpressible glory and constituting absolutely every form of virtue and its beauty? If so, then how
[133] could what I have said not be clear to everyone?

Why, then, does he mock such exceptional realities? And why does he also jeer at the fact that of all the living creatures on earth, the most godlike one endowed with intellect and reason – I mean humanity – should have been honored with an authority over all else? Surely the very nature of the facts themselves agree with the words that came through Moses. Nevertheless, Julian completely disregards what is reasonable and

[123] *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas.; Wright 1923, 332–37. Julian's second quotation is from Plato, *Ti.* 41ad. He quotes the entirety of the speech given by Plato's Craftsman or Demiurge to the young gods in this famous passage of the *Timaeus*. The passage was also discussed by Origen at *Cels.* 6.10.

[124] As the GCS apparatus proposes, Cyril's defensive posture in the next two paragraphs implies that, following his quotation of Gen 1:26–28 in *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas., Julian criticized the Mosaic account of humanity's creation in the divine image, but Cyril has apparently chosen not to quote this section. Celsus had previously mocked the *Genesis* story of the creation of humanity. Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 6.49.

instead inclines with no restraint towards the requirement that one should cling solely to Plato's words. In fact, without giving it due consideration, he has marveled at the "*speech*" fabricated by Plato – I know not how – which he says the God "*of the universe*" has actually delivered to certain generated and falsely named "gods."

2.35 It is, I think, incumbent upon us to respond to him on this point as well. For if, on the one hand, in this passage Plato is inventing a character and employing poetic license[125] to attribute to the character of "God" words that he thought were appropriate for him, he has missed his target by no small amount,[126] and someone could criticize him for not knowing how to portray God as a character in the manner required.[127] But if, on the other hand, he is pretending to record God's actual voice, away with his nonsense! For it is in fact not right to say that the God who has authority over the universe allows those who are not truly gods to share in the honor that is distinctly appropriate for him and him alone.[128] For he said, "My glory I will not give to another nor my excellences to carved images."[129]

Come now, without going on at length, let us set the truth in opposition to Plato's words and say the following. Let us concede, if he wants, that the intelligent powers above which were brought into existence by [134]
God have been honored with the title "god." For we admit that there are certain beings in heaven who have been called both "gods" and "lords."[130] But also we ourselves have been crowned with such a title, since God says to us, "I said, 'You are gods and are all sons of the Most High.'"[131] In these instances, however, there is a certain most essential reason for him to do so and this magnanimous statement made by God to us would in fact be exceedingly correct: since "*the Craftsman of the universe*" had fashioned the intelligent and rational creation according to his own image and likeness, seeing as he is good as well, he also honored it with the title

[125] Gk.: κατὰ νόμον τῶν ποιητῶν.

[126] Gk.: σκοποῦ. Though Cyril's claim above is about Plato, he will elsewhere make similar accusations against Julian; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.3.5–6; 7.2.8–9; 8.1.3; 9.11.1–6; fr. 24. For the polemical identification of the aim of Julian's work, see *c. Iul.* 3.38.1–9. This rhetorical criticism is related to Cyril's complaint that Julian's treatise lacks order and is repetitive (*c. Iul.* 2.2.13–23).

[127] It may be that Cyril considers this possibility because he has just admitted at *c. Iul.* 2.28.12–2.29.11 that the Mosaic cosmogony employs "hyperbolic" language by attributing internal deliberation to God when in fact no such deliberation was required. On poetic license, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.25.22–29 with note.

[128] On the following critique of the idea that the Craftsman of the *Timaeus* delegates the creation of mortal beings to the younger gods, see also Augustine, *C. D.* 12.25–27, who similarly rejects this aspect of Platonic cosmology. On Julian's and Cyril's differing notions of divine transcendence in the creation and providential management of the cosmos, see Boulnois 2006.

[129] Isa 42:8. [130] Cf. 1 Cor 8:5. [131] Ps 81(82):6.

"god." And there is nothing unreasonable about this, since we ourselves also are accustomed to name the image of a human, so to speak, by the same name "human." **2.36** Therefore, the intelligent and rational creation, inasmuch as God holds it in higher regard than the nonrational and nonintelligent creation, has manifestly been granted the better glory, having been gilded with the title "god."

In contrast, not a single one of the other creatures has been called "god." For if one wanted a proof that the heaven or simply the cosmos is neither a living creature nor indeed at all endowed with soul, even if there were no one on our side who chose to point this out and even if you set aside the others who are said to be wise, Aristotle, Plato's very own disciple, would suffice. For he said, as we already emphasized
[135] previously,[132] that the whole cosmos is neither ensouled throughout nor is it rational or intelligent. Therefore, because the force of the truth prevents [Aristotle] from saying that the whole cosmos – or whatever [Plato] means by "*the All*," since that is what he called it[133] – is either ensouled or intelligent throughout, [Plato] has, even in his own camp, as I said, the most formidable resistance from those who are dearest to him above all.

Furthermore, the nature of the matter itself, if we subject it to an appropriate examination, should prove to us that God would not have told those ensouled and intelligent gods, who in fact are not gods at all, that they must create. For why would "*the Craftsman of the universe*," after having reflected on the matter entirely on his own, have entrusted to the other gods the toil required to create the "*three races*"? Maybe they would say that he did so because he hesitated[134] or because he thought our affairs were not worth taking into account. But such ideas would be entirely alien to the substance transcending all substances, at least in my view.

2.37 For if the Craftsman is good, how could any hesitation have come upon him about anything whatsoever? For Plato himself at one point says the following: "He was good, and no envy about anything

[132] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.15.11–12; 2.17.10–12.

[133] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 41c3–4, cited at *c. Gal.* fr. 9.27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33.13).

[134] Cyril's ensuing discussion suggests that the "hesitating" he has in mind is not morally neutral but results from some kind of ethical defect. The argument that to suppose God needed help in creating the world would entail ascribing "envy" (φθόνος) and "hesitation" (ὄκνος) to him also appears in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 1.8.1–7. See also the arguments against the existence of multiple creators at Athanasius, *Gent.* 39. On the role of divine envy and goodness in Cyril's understanding of creation and incarnation, see Boulnois 2008c; Crawford forthcoming.

comes upon someone who is good."[135] Yet to say that God disowns something as unworthy of him would be nothing other than to assign vanity [136]
to him and to bring against him the indictment of being contemptuous. And why would he choose to rule over those beings when he disdained the task of creating them? Or how could he delight in our worship, if already at the outset he thought the task of creating us was altogether worthless?

Now it would be exceedingly easy for me to bring forward a great many true testimonies from the God-breathed scripture showing that he does want us to honor him, demands that we be docile, and determines that human nature must become like himself through every virtue. Since, however, Julian places his trust instead in his own authors, I will point out that Porphyry has written as follows in the second book of his *On Abstinence from Ensouled Things*:

> Let us, too, then sacrifice but let us sacrifice as is proper […][136] to the God who is over all, as a certain wise man said,[137] neither burning nor dedicating anything belonging to the senses. For there is nothing material that is not immediately unclean to the immaterial. Therefore, not even a word spoken with the voice is appropriate to him, nor is the inner word when it has been defiled by the soul's passion. But we shall worship him with a pure silence and with pure thoughts about him. It is, then, necessary for us to be united to him and made like him and then to offer our own [137]
> manner of life to God as a sacred sacrifice, the very same thing that is both our hymn and our salvation. Therefore, this sacrifice is performed in the soul's passionless state and in the vision of God.[138]

[135] Plato, *Ti.* 29e. Cyril also cites this line in a similar discussion at *Dial. Trin.* 4.524.33–34. Other authors who quote or allude to the line include Atticus, fr. 5.2 Baudry (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 15.5.2); Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.21.2; Eusebius (?), *Hierocl.* 6.37–38 DesPlaces/Forrat; Athanasius, *Gent.* 41.14 Thomson; Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.8 (PG 39.601a); Theodoret, *Affect.* 4.33; Philoponus, *De aet.* 1.4, 13.12–14; 5.3, 109.1–3; 6.27, 225.1–2; 15.3, 558.24–25 Rabe.

[136] Cyril omits the phrase "making different sacrifices to different powers" (διαφόρους τὰς θυσίας ὡς ἂν διαφόροις δυνάμεσι προσάγοντες), perhaps because he thought admitting the existence of diverse divine "powers" would undermine his point.

[137] The "wise man" is Apollonius of Tyana who wrote a treatise titled *On Sacrifices*, from which survives only a single fragment, cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.13. Eusebius' extract includes the sentence μὴ θύοι τι τὴν ἀρχὴν μήτε ἀνάπτοι πῦρ μήτε καθόλου τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἐπονομάζοι ("he shall neither sacrifice something at the beginning nor kindle fire nor dedicate anything at all of what is sensible"), which must be the idea Porphyry is alluding to here. Philostratus makes mention of Apollonius' *On Sacrifices* at *VA* 3.41.

[138] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.34. This passage had been quoted previously by Eusebius at *P.e.* 4.11 and *D.e.* 3.3.10. Cyril, however, was not simply relying upon Eusebius, since he started his extract one sentence earlier than had his predecessor. Presumably then he had recourse to Porphyry's text himself, but he might have been led to the passage after having come across it in Eusebius; see "Cyril's Sources" in our Introduction.

2.38 God, therefore, does wish to be honored by us and for us to represent him intellectually through our pure way of life, as we inscribe his beauty within our souls. If so, then tell me how can he demand this from us, if he has all but cast us aside to other craftsmen and, if I may say so, withheld from us the personal attention he bestowed on all the other creatures? And why does he bother at all to exercise providence over those on earth, when, as Plato supposes, they have been given to the other gods as a plaything?[139] For the one who knows God as his own Father will himself teach us that he exercises providence over us and that his care and kindness extend even to the most insignificant matters, since he says, "Are not two sparrows sold for an assarion? And not one of them will fall
[138] to the earth apart from our Father who is in heaven."[140]

Nevertheless, Julian will probably cross out this saying on the grounds that it is not true – for he bizarrely fights against God – and will accept instead those who were his close associates, in the sense, that is, of sharing his delusion. Well then, Alexander, the disciple of Aristotle, writes as follows in his book *On Providence*:

> To say that God does not want to exercise providence over those here below is entirely alien to God. For it is characteristic of an envious and altogether monstrous nature to fail to do what is better when one has the ability to do so.
>
> Since both of these are alien to God, neither both of them nor just one of them is true of him. Therefore, it remains that the divine is both able and willing to exercise providence over those here below, and if he is both willing and able, it is clear that he does in fact exercise providence. It is, then, irrational to suppose that anything, even the most trifling occur-
> [139] rences, happens in the absence of the divine decision and will.
>
> **2.39** Some people say that Plato also holds this view, and obviously Zeno of Citium and the followers of the Stoa represent this doctrine.[141]

[139] Cf. Plato, *Leg.* 1.644d8–9; 7.803c4–5 (θεοῦ τι παίγνιον).

[140] Matt 10:29. Cyril's version of this verse has "our" Father in place of "your" Father and also adds "who is in heaven." Origen and Athanasius also cited the passage with the latter phrase. See Origen, *Mart.* 34; *Cels.* 8.70; Athanasius, *Ar.* 2.25.2.

[141] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 2 Riedweg (= fr. 1 Grant = vers.arab. D18, pp.89–90 Thillet). This is the first of six or seven fragments from Alexander of Aphrodisias' treatise *On Providence* quoted by Cyril in *c. Iul.*, which are the sole surviving portions of the work in Greek, though two separate Arabic translations of most of the treatise also exist (one known as D15 and the other as D18). Four of Cyril's Greek fragments overlap with the Arabic translations. There exist two editions and English translations of the Greek fragments preserved in *c. Iul.*: Grant 1964, 277–79 (who was unaware of the Arabic tradition); and Riedweg 2011. See Riedweg's discussion of this fragment on pp.283–85. Grant did not include the first sentence of *c. Iul.* 2.39 in Alexander's passage, though Riedweg did on the basis of the Arabic tradition. Riedweg pointed out that the Arabic tradition makes clear that this fragment "belongs to Alexander's

Therefore, even they too have testified that the supreme God of the universe, who is the only God by nature, exercises providence over our affairs as well. Someone might then say, "So what?" Well, it would have been out of character for one who had deigned to exercise providence to deprive the human race of what was best of all, namely to be made by him instead of being relegated to certain generated[142] craftsmen who merely have the title "god" superficially and not based on inherent properties;[143] not to mention that to suppose others also have the ability to create and to call into existence what previously did not exist will especially bring one into open conflict with the divine glory itself. For it is in fact not right to say that the distinctive characteristics and excellencies of the divine and ineffable nature can inhere naturally in any of those beings created by it. Rather, the task is suitable for the divine nature and it alone, and is consistent with its supreme glory. For as I just said,[144] the properties that uniquely belong to the only substance that is above all substances are inaccessible to the creature and we maintain that one such property is the ability to work like a Craftsman and to bring into existence what previously did not exist. If so, then how could the generated [140]
nature, which has been made and which is invariably and unavoidably characterized by inevitable corruption – insofar, that is, as the principles inherent to its nature are concerned – how could it accomplish those deeds that belong to God?

2.40 Now if the act of creating is understood as a kind of knowledge in God, one would concede that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the knowledge of how to create can be given by him to the creature, since we ourselves also create from time to time, taking some material substrate and applying to it a technical skill appropriate to it. If, however, the act of creating in a divine manner is, as I said, an activity and ability belonging to a magnificent nature, one that exceeds the limitations of the creature, why do they debase the dignity of the supreme

doxographical summary of the Stoic doctrine" (p. 283), which confirms a hypothesis suggested earlier by Grant (p. 276). Riedweg also argued that Cyril has modified the fragment to suit his apologetic agenda, including changing Alexander's originally plural references to "gods" to the singular "God" (p. 284). If so, Cyril would not be the first to have done so. Philo of Alexandria may have made similar changes in his quotations of Plato. Cf. Runia 1997. In addition to *On Providence*, Cyril also quotes a passage from Alexander's treatise *On Fate* at *c. Iul.* 3.9. Cyril's contemporaries Synesius of Cyrene and Hierocles of Alexandria also showed an interest in books by Alexander (Synesius, *Ep*. 129; Hierocles, *Prov*. 214.4.172b; 251.6.461b).

[142] The GCS text here reads γεννητούς ("begotten") but mss FME have γενητούς ("generated"). The latter is more consistent with Cyril's use of cognate terms to describe these beings in the paragraphs that follow, so we have opted for it.

[143] Gk.: θύραθεν, literally, "from the outside."

[144] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.35.

nature and, as seems right to them, bestow this honor upon beings subject to generation and decay?

So they believe they are grasping some crucial point but instead are actually defaming the divine statements, since they say that the one who is ungenerated entrusted to generated beings the ability to carry out deeds that were his alone. "Yes," they say, "for if God were to create something, of course it was also unavoidable that it would be altogether superior to the processes of death and corruption."[145] Then, my dear friends, it must be that the Craftsman begrudged certain other beings and did not permit them to partake of what is most excellent, but
[141] plunged them into a worse situation by refusing to create them. Did he fear the necessity that prevented him from being able to create mortal beings, or was he perhaps somehow even completely unaware of how to do so? Now, if they claim he was ignorant, then his creation[146] knows something more than him. For, as the Greeks themselves say, [the created gods] were the ones who created everything subject to corruption. But if, on the contrary, they do not take that position and insist that he did know [how to create mortal beings], how could it be characteristic of a good being to fail to do what he knew was good?[147] Surely immortality is better than mortality!

2.41 Additionally, it would not, in my view, indicate ignorance but rather wisdom for me to say the following. The gods to whom they say the Emperor and Lord of the universe entrusted the act of creating, they also say are not immortal but are bound together and soluble and remain outside the process of corruption so long as God wills for them to exist in these conditions.[148] Since, therefore, nothing is incorruptible or immortal or indissoluble according to its own nature, how could it not be a sign of ignorance for them to say that the God of the universe refused to create the three mortal races, and instead handed over this task to others that they should do it?[149]

[145] An allusion to Plato, *Ti.* 41c, quoted by Julian in *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33).

[146] i.e., the lesser deities of the *Timaeus*.

[147] Cyril here echoes a point made in the fragment from Alexander of Aphrodisias in *c. Iul.* 2.38.

[148] Cyril alludes to Plato, *Ti.* 41b, quoted by Julian in *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33). The dependence of the younger gods upon the will of the Craftsman for their eternal existence is also highlighted by Augustine, *C. D.* 10.31; 13.16–17 (quoting the relevant passage from the *Timaeus*); 22.26.

[149] Cyril's point here is somewhat obscure, but the logic seems to be as follows. The Greeks say the Craftsman could not create the "three mortal races" because the task was beneath him (presumably in light of the fact that these were mortal beings, far down on the ontological scale). The other gods to whom he entrusted this task, and whom he had in fact created, were not, properly speaking, immortal but only existed in this state thanks to the divine will. Therefore, if God

But since we have set aside the nonsense of the Greeks, we say that the Craftsman, using an authority that is most fitting to his divinity, has made the diversity and variety evident in creation and is responsible for the fact that each thing is different in various ways and not the same in genus and species. For, as I said, nothing is immortal or indissoluble, but God's will for each thing he has made constitutes its nature, and, without any hesitation, reaches down even as far as our affairs. For he is one and unique, and does not learn this from someone else, since it is not a [142]
matter of a form of knowledge but of a divine privilege of his nature, attached to it and it alone, just like the rest of the honors that are scarcely attainable by generated beings and have been naturally assigned, as I said, to this nature and to it alone.

Moreover, one could observe from Julian's own teachers[150] as well that it is utterly bizarre for us to assign the activity of creating to other gods, divorcing it from the one who is truly God by nature. **2.42** For Hermes who is called Thrice-Greatest writes as follows about the nature of the All:

> If, then, it has been agreed that two entities exist, that which comes to be and that which makes, they are one by unification – the antecedent and the consequent. The antecedent is the God who makes, and that which comes to be is the consequent, whatever it may be. And there is no need for the varied quality of what has come to be to put you on your guard and make you fear that you are attributing lowliness and disgrace to God. For his single glory is to make all things, and this making is like the body of God. And nothing bad or shameful is believed to attach to the maker himself. For these are the by-products of the process of generation, like corrosion on bronze and dirt on the

deigned to create the "mortal" gods (mortal in the sense of needing the divine will to remain immortal), why would he balk at the idea of also creating the "three mortal races"? In other words, Cyril is attempting to identify a contradiction internal to the metaphysical scheme outlined in the *Timaeus*: is God able and willing to create mortal beings or not?

[150] The subsequent quotation from the Hermetic corpus implies that Hermes Thrice-Greatest was one of Julian's "teachers." Julian does refer in passing to the Egyptian Hermes at *c. Gal.* fr. 37.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.33.8), though there is no evidence that he engaged with Hermetic literature, and, somewhat surprisingly, the corpus was of little interest to Neoplatonists even though they made much use of similar revelatory literature like the *Chaldean Oracles* (cf. Copenhaver 1992, xliii). Iamblichus mentioned writings attributed to Hermes translated from Egyptian into Greek by philosophically minded persons at *Myst.* 8.4, but did not interact with this body of literature in his surviving works. For another rare mention of Hermes Thrice-Greatest in a Neoplatonic text, see Hermias, *in Phdr.* 99.6. Cyril's presentation of Hermes Thrice-Greatest as one of Julian's teachers probably is due simply to the fact that he took Hermes to be an exemplar of wisdom highly esteemed by Greek intellectuals of his day.

[143] body. But neither did the bronzeworker make the corrosion nor the parents make the dirt.[151]

Further on,[152] Hermes speaks in more vivid terms by giving a clear example and says,

> Given that one and the same painter is allowed to make the heaven, the earth, the sea, gods, humans, all things irrational and without a soul, is it not possible for God to make all things? O how great are people's stupidity and ignorance about God! For such people suffer the most terrible thing of all. While claiming that they are honoring God and singing his praises by not attributing the making of all things to him, they in fact do not even know him. In addition to not knowing him, they commit the greatest sacrilege against him by attributing to him the condition[153] of contempt or of impotence. For if he did not make all things, either he did not make them because he despised the task or because he was unable to do so, which are sacrilegious ideas. For God has only one condition,[154] which is goodness, and the one who is good is neither contemptuous nor
[144] impotent. This is what God is: the good, the entire power to make all things. That which is generated comes to be by the one who is good and who is able to make all things.
>
> But if you want to learn how he makes, how what has come to be came to be, it is possible for you to do so. Observe a most beautiful image that corresponds most closely to him: a farmer, casting seeds upon the earth, here wheat, there barley, and there some other kind of seed. Observe him planting a vine and an apple tree and the other kinds of trees. In the same manner, God also sows immortality in heaven, and on earth change, and in everything life and movement.[155]

2.43 Thus, the ancient Greek wise men who were by no means insignificant held these views and indeed also thought others should choose to

[151] *Corp.Herm.* 14.6–7. This passage and the following one come from the fourteenth of the Hermetic discourses that have been passed down in the manuscript tradition, bearing the title "From Hermes Thrice-Greatest, to Asclepius, health of mind" (Ἀσκληπιῷ εὖ φρονεῖν) (2.222 Nock and Festugière; trans. Copenhaver 1992, 55). Nock and Festugière (2.220) suggested that the discourse could be titled "On the Nature of the All," since Cyril introduces the passage with the phrase περί τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως, echoing the opening line of the discourse: "While you were absent, my son Tat wanted to learn the nature of the universe." The theme of the short discourse is the creation of the cosmos, specifically the necessity of a creator and the distinction between creator and creation.

[152] Assuming he was working from an edition of the Hermetic discourse akin to what has come down to us in the manuscript tradition, Cyril skips only a sentence and a half between the previous fragment and the subsequent one: "nor did God make evil. But the persistence of generation makes evil bloom like a sore, which is why God has made change, to repurify generation" (2.225 Nock and Festugière; trans. Copenhaver 1992, 56).

[153] Gk.: πάθος. [154] Gk.: πάθος. [155] *Corp.Herm.* 14.8–10.

hold them too. However, the fair-minded Julian, who despises the herd, has said farewell to the views of others and yields to Plato's words alone. In fact, he tries to clarify the speech that Plato, wisely in his view, has the character of God make. For he writes: [145]

Julian

But surely this is not a dream, is it? Reflect upon it and learn. Plato gives the name "gods" to those that are visible – the sun and moon, along with the stars and the heaven – but these are images of invisible gods. The sun that is visible to our eyes is an image of the intelligible and invisible sun, and again the moon visible to our eyes and each of the stars are images of the intelligible ones. Plato was, then, aware of these <intelligible and>[156] *invisible gods that subsist in and coexist [with the Craftsman], and have been begotten by the Craftsman himself and have proceeded from him.*[157] *It is reasonable, therefore, that the Craftsman in Plato's account says "gods," speaking to the invisible ones, and "of* [146] *gods," meaning the visible ones.*[158] *And the common Craftsman of them both is the one who devised the heaven, the earth, the sea, and the stars, begetting archetypes of these things in the intelligible realms.*

Observe, then, that what is said subsequently is also well put. For he says, "there remain three mortal races,"[159] *that is, the race of humans, of animals, and of plants. For each of these has been defined by its own principles. "If then," he says, "each of these should also come to exist by me, it would be absolutely unavoidable that they would become immortal."*[160] *For there is no other cause for the immortality of the gods and the visible cosmos than the fact that they came to exist by the Craftsman.*[161]

2.44 *What does he then say? "Whatever in them is immortal must have been given by the Craftsman" – and this is the rational soul. "Therefore, when* [147] *I have sown the forms of these and caused them to subsist, with your consent, I will hand them on to you. Finally, you weave the mortal with the immortal."*[162] *It is, then, clear that the creative gods, after receiving from their own father the creative power, begot the mortal animals on earth. For if heaven was going to be no different from humanity and, by Zeus, no different*

[156] The GCS edition follows Neumann's proposed addition of νοητοὺς καί, based on Cyril's reference to this line at *c. Iul.* 2.45.8–11.

[157] Julian's emphasis on this point is probably intended as a contrast to Moses' cosmogony which makes no mention of "a single incorporeal thing" made by God (*c. Gal.* fr. 6.34 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.19.10]).

[158] Plato, *Ti.* 41a. Throughout this fragment Julian is exegeting the passage from the *Timaeus* that he quoted in *c. Gal.* fr. 9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.32–33).

[159] Plato, *Ti.* 41b. [160] A paraphrase of Plato, *Ti.* 41c.

[161] Celsus made a similar claim, that God made only immortal beings, with mortals being the product of the immortals made by God (Origen, *Cels.* 4.52).

[162] A paraphrase of Plato, *Ti.* 41cd.

> *from the animals and finally the creeping things themselves and the little fish swimming in the sea, it would have required that there be one and the same Craftsman for everything. But if there is a great gap between immortals and mortals – the immortal part, in comparison with the mortal things subject to decay, not becoming greater by any addition nor less by subtraction – it follows that some beings were the cause of mortals and others were the cause of immortals.*[163]

Cyril

Now it is exceedingly easy, for anyone who wishes to do so, to perceive that in this passage Julian confuses everything and jumbles together the natures of things. For he first says that the more visible gods are images of the more invisible gods, those that Plato thought right to call "intelligible"[164] and "knowable,"[165] while he called visible things "that which is
[148] subject to judgment using the senses."[166] With these words, our most excellent Julian seems to be intending to clarify the "ideas," which Plato at one point maintains subsist in themselves as substances, while elsewhere he defines them as being the thoughts of God.[167] **2.45** But, whatever the case may be, those skilled in these topics say that Plato's argument on this point was found to be unacceptable even by his own disciples. For Aristotle says "Good riddance to the forms. For they are mere prattle and, even if they do exist, are irrelevant."[168] Why then does Julian think it a good idea to endorse and try to introduce as an unobjectionable view a supposition that even his own teachers thought was incorrect?

Next, in addition to this we will also find another statement of his that is sick with a serious case of ignorance. For he says, "*Plato was aware of the intelligible and* more *invisible of the gods that subsist in and coexist [with the Craftsman], and have been begotten by the Craftsman himself and have*

[163] *c. Gal.* fr. 10 Mas.; Wright 1923, 336–39. On this fragment, cf. Finamore 1988; Riedweg 2008b.
[164] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 37a. [165] Cf. Plato, *Tht.* 201d. [166] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 28a, 28c.
[167] On this point, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.17.
[168] Aristotle, *APo.* 83a32–33. This passage appears infrequently in surviving ancient Greek literature. Prior to Cyril, Heraclitus alludes to it in the midst of a criticism of Plato at *All.* 78.4, and Origen mentions it to illustrate disagreement between Platonists and Peripatetics at *Cels.* 1.13; 2.12. It later appears in Zacharias of Mytilene, *Amm.* II, 942–52. On Zacharias' possible reception of Cyril's *c. Iul.*, see the Introduction to this volume. Proclus also alluded to this passage in a fragment of a work titled *An Examination of Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Timaeus* quoted in Philoponus, *De aet.* 2.2, 31 (trans. Share 2005, 36). In the same section of this work Philoponus himself also cited the passage as evidence of Aristotle's rejection of the theory of the forms, against others who had attempted to harmonize the two philosophers.

proceeded from him." And he adds that the God of the universe, who devised the earth and the heaven and begot the stars, is the Craftsman of both the visible and the intelligible [gods]. Hence, given that, as he himself has clearly conceded, the ungenerated God is the generator of both the former and the latter, how can he say both that these gods were generated by him and that they coexist with him and subsist in him? How, tell me, can the generated coexist with the ungenerated God? And in what way can it subsist in him? As for us, we maintain that the Word of God, [149] which is ungenerated, necessarily coexists with the one who engendered him and that, while he subsists in him, he has also proceeded from him in the sense of begetting. But, in contrast, that defender of Plato's ingenious language, being so precise, says on the one hand that the supreme God is ungenerated, but on the other hand that those things made by him subsist in him and were begotten and proceeded from him, in this way mixing everything up and throwing it into confusion, and disregarding entirely the purity required for the vision of God. **2.46** One could say to Julian that proverb on the lips of many: "Far apart are the lands of the Mysians and the Phrygians."[169] Abandon such insipid, pointless myths, O man! The topic of your discourse is the God who is beyond all things, but you have been caught possessing an altogether paltry view of his glory.

Next, after presenting him as the generator of the universe and the only one who could have produced such brilliant and marvelous things in creation, Julian says other gods helped with the lower parts of the universe and cooperated with him in the act of creating. These gods might perhaps even say to the God over all, "Collect a contribution from us and then introduce the three mortal races that are missing from the universe. For when you provide a soul, we ourselves will add the body, weaving the mortal with the immortal." Nevertheless, Julian will prob- [150] ably respond and fight for his own doctrines by reinforcing his ranks with the argument that the nature of earthly bodies is produced by the congregating of the elements. Now in this respect as well he is following his own instructors. For they say that Empedocles son of Meton in fact held this view too and indeed also chose to think in this manner. For he says that the principles of those things that exist are fire, air, water, and earth, and he adds to them love and strife.[170] And Plotinus also mentioned these

[169] This fragment of unattributed Greek tragedy (TrGF 2.560 Kannicht) was mentioned by Strabo (12.4.4; 12.8.2) and also cited by Gregory of Nazianzus in three of his poems (*Carm*. 2.1.11.1240; 12.662; 39.102 [PG 37.1114a, 1214a, 1336a]).

[170] Cyril is perhaps drawing upon Ps-Plutarch, *Plac*. 1.3, 878a, which had previously been quoted in Eusebius, *P.e.* 14.14.6. Cf. Empedocles fr. 31 B 17.4-8 D-K (= D73.236-41 Laks/Most).

things in his treatise *On the Three Primary Hypostases*, saying the following: "And, for Empedocles, strife divides, but love is the One – he also makes it incorporeal – and the elements are posited as matter."[171]

2.47 Consequently, even if the congregating of the elements should contribute some advantage deriving from themselves to earthly bodies, we shall not accept the point without an investigation. For it is incumbent upon us to examine[172] the question of who it is that directs them to come together and gathers together into a unity the elements that are
[151] naturally opposed and, as it were, tames them, with the result that the force of each of them does not remain unmixed with the others, but with all of them, as it were, converging with one another into the subsistence and existence of one particular thing.[173] Is not God the one who does this, the artisan most skilled in every domain, who wisely devises this process for earthly bodies, in order that they might participate in all of the elements and so derive benefit from them? For love means that things are related to one another.[174]

Therefore, the craftsmen of the three races cannot be some other [gods]; rather, the one who is supreme and unique and who is the first principle of all things is reasonably understood to be the generator of all. After him, there is absolutely nothing beyond, but rather everything is by him and through him and under his feet, as his creation.

Moreover, the writings of the Greeks even maintain that God rejoices over his works,[175] which we too say, since the God-breathed scripture

[171] Plotinus 5.1.9.5–7 (trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 544, modified). This is the first quotation of Plotinus in the treatise. A further one occurs at *c. Iul.* 4.42, followed by several more in *c. Iul.* 8.30–39. Cyril appears to be the only Christian author to have cited this passage in our surviving literature.

[172] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσομεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[173] Cyril also mentions the four elements as being an area of interest for intellectually minded pagans in *Ep. Fest.* 6.4 (dated to 418):

> They present fire, water, air, and earth as the principles of reality, and fancy that they have found in the congregating [σύνοδον] of the elements the root of things which come to be. Then, when they should seek the Commander and Governor of the things mentioned and should go back from the beauty of created things to God, the Giver of their beauty, they bestow all of their admiration upon the things made. How could they have been more greatly mistaken? How could anyone examine the nature of reality more senselessly? (trans. Amidon and O'Keefe 2009, 106, modified)

Athanasius had previously argued for the existence of a divine designer on the basis of the fact that elements naturally opposed to one another come together to produce the order and harmony evident in the cosmos (*Gent.* 36–38; 41).

[174] Gk.: φίλον γάρ πως τὸ συγγενές.

[175] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 37c6–7: "And when the Father who had begotten [the universe] perceived it set in motion and alive, an image in honor of the eternal gods, he rejoiced."

itself agrees with this. For indeed Wisdom says, "I was the one in whom he rejoiced. And day by day I was glad in his presence at every moment, when he was glad at the completion of the world and was glad among the sons of humanity."[176] If so, then how is it not better that he should exult in his own creatures rather than in the creatures of others? [152]

2.48 Plato, however, says the Craftsman was arguably overcome by hesitation or, as I said, out of envy he did not want those on earth to possess what was better. And this is not at all surprising, given that Plato places the Good even above the very god who creates and says that the Good is immovable, unshakeable, stable, and far removed from the obligation and the intention of producing any of those beings brought into existence, and that, as if recoiling[177] from them, it entrusted the task of creating to the second god who is from him and with him.[178] Nevertheless, observe how, even alongside the second god, Plato appoints still other gods who know how to perform the same operation, so that there might be nothing about the second god that appears to be too exalted.[179]

Now since Julian thinks it is a wise and exact argument to say that, if the Craftsman of the universe is understood to be one and unique, heaven would differ in no way from humanity or the wild beasts or those animals that naturally swim in the sea and indeed also the creeping things – and thus one must even introduce a Craftsman that is proportional to the measure of each thing made – come let us respond to him on this point also. How would it be at odds with correct notions, or in opposition to them, to choose to say that everything is due to one [153] Craftsman? For would the power that sufficed [to create] such transcendent entities not suffice for things that are in fact inferior? Or, if it did lie within his power to do so, then does the transcendence and excellence of those beings who are especially superior to the rest consist solely in the fact that they have been granted personal creation by God himself? **2.49** If so, then would this not be an arbitrary allotment peculiar to them, as if God had disdained the rest of the creatures and all but bid a long farewell to earthly beings?

[176] Prov 8:30–31.

[177] Gk.: κατοκνῆσαν. Note the connection with ὄκνος ("hesitation") mentioned earlier in this paragraph.

[178] On the distinction between the "first God" and the "creative God," see Numenius, fr. 12 des Places, cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18; as well as Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith, cited by Cyril at *c. Iul.* 1.47; 8.27.

[179] Similar criticisms of the Platonic hierarchy appear at *c. Iul.* 3.34.12–16; 4.39.1–10; 4.42.18–29; 5.34.1–12; 8.26–30; 9.9.18–25.

As we have said already, these arguments are nonsense and full of the most extreme stupidity. Nevertheless, let Julian explain this for us. He says the begotten gods produced the three remaining races. But do we not clearly see among these three races – even setting aside human affairs – such a massive difference in terms of genera and species and sizes of bodies? For the generation of the three races would extend from the highest beings down to the most insignificant of all, and someone would not be incorrect if they included even the very plants in this claim. Shall we then allocate for each of the created things its own craftsman proportional to it, lest a god's transcendent majesty be insulted if he should be labelled the creator of very lowly entities as well? Humanity would therefore quite reasonably have one craftsman, and there would be as many other craftsmen as there are things that have been made, descending all the way to the most extremely insignificant things.[180] Tell me, then, is this not risible claptrap, which ultimately carries one away from what is reasonable and the notions that lead to the truth? How could this not be
[154] clear to everyone?

But, of course, it should be obvious that together with his instructors he delights in views that are insalubrious and eccentric. For he actually maintains that the heaven is God and once more says the following:

Julian

2.50 *What need is there for me to call the Greeks and the Hebrews as witnesses to this? There is no one who, when praying, does not stretch his hands to heaven; no one who when swearing by one God or several – and so forming a general concept of the divine – is not transported to that heavenly realm. And this experience of theirs is not unreasonable. For since they saw that none of those things that move about the heaven are diminished or increase, nor do*
[155] *they change or suffer any irregular influence, but its movement is harmonious and its order is elegant, with the laws governing the moon being fixed, and the rising and setting of the sun being fixed, always occurring at fixed times – seeing all this, it was reasonable for them to suppose it is a god and the throne of a god.*

For, such a being, inasmuch as it is neither increased by any addition nor diminished by any subtraction and stands beyond all change due to alteration and variation, is pure of all corruption and generation. Being by nature immortal and indestructible, it is pure from every kind of defilement. Being

[180] Cyril will employ a very similar *reductio ad absurdum* at *c. Iul.* 7.26.13–20 to critique the idea that each domain of life has its own presiding deity.

eternal and ever-moving, as we can see, it is either carried in a circle around the great Craftsman due to a greater and more divine soul indwelling it or, having received its motion from God himself (in the same way, I think, our [156]
bodies have from the soul in us), it wheels about its endless circuit with an unceasing and eternal impulse.[181]

Cyril

2.51 Now it is transparent that these are the words of someone who is delirious and completely devoid of true ideas. But, since he has gotten the notion – how I do not know – that he will have sufficient proof that heaven is God from the fact that people intending to pray raise their hands and eyes up high, come let us respond to him on this point. Tell me, then, if someone had the idea of observing clouds and if he directed the eye of his body upwards towards them, would this fact suffice to convince him that he must also confess them to be goddesses? If not, then how would a person whisked away into error by such insipid ideas not be an appropriate object of laughter?

But since, he says, heaven has reasonably been regarded as a marvel and assumed by many to be both "*God*" and "*God's throne*" on the grounds of its natural features, let Julian come forward and teach us whether he thinks these two claims are identical and whether he regards them as belonging to the same category. But I doubt he would ever reach such a degree of madness as to think that "to be *God*" and "to be *God's throne*" differ in no way at all. For hardly anyone would doubt that [157]
matters related to God are, quite reasonably, not understood with our senses nor indeed in terms of bodies, even if they should perhaps be spoken of in a manner that falls short of what is required. Therefore, if one were to speak of "God's throne," it would indicate the kingdom under his rule, just as, for example, also on our level it is true to say that the throne of some person is radiant and preeminent, meaning his rule and his kingdom.[182]

2.52 If so, then how could that which is under authority be on level footing with that which exercises authority, that which governs be equal to the lowly estate of its subjects, that which is exalted be on the same

[181] *c. Gal.* fr. 11 Mas.; Wright 1923, 322–23. This fragment is strongly reminiscent of Aristotle, *Cael.* 1.3, 270ab, including the claim that heaven moves in a circle and is eternal, unchanging, incorruptible, and ungenerated, and that both Greeks and barbarians form a conception of the divine by looking to it.

[182] Cf. Cyril's description of the radiant "scepters" of Theodosius II in *c. Iul.* Dedic.1.

plane as those that are in submission to it, that which falls short be equivalent to that which excels? How, then, or in what way can he say that heaven is either "*God*" or "*God's throne*"?

"Nevertheless," Julian says, "the *movement* of the heaven is orderly, *harmonious*, and *elegant*; and the *sun and moon* naturally provide illuminations that are *fixed*; and the *risings and settings* of the stars, their revolutions and courses and movements throughout space, are invariably the same at every moment." If so, then was not the divine Paul exceedingly wise, since he uses such observations to identify the ruler and governor of creation's good order, who, in keeping with his divinity, ordains how each of those things created by him should exist and shows that such a manifold and immeasurable creative act is not without oversight, by which heaven is maintained in good order and made something marvelous? For
[158] he says, "For since the creation of the world, his invisible attributes, namely his eternal power and divinity, are clearly visible, apprehended in the things that have been made."[183]

It seemed good also to those who were Julian's instructors to adhere to these ideas in their thinking and discourse. Hence, as we already said earlier, Plutarch said about them: "But they received a conception of God from this. For the sun, moon, and the rest of the stars, after being carried along under the earth, always rise with the same colors, equal to their sizes and in the same positions."[184] **2.53** Therefore, those long ago who were the inventors of Julian's doctrines did not arrive at a conception of heaven when marveling at the course of the sun and after having observed that likewise every other created thing is orderly and harmonious and is allotted a not inelegant movement; rather they deduced the power of the one ruling over it and discerned his glorious and exalted sovereignty.

Julian, however, changes their view on this very point as well into its complete opposite when he says, "Heaven *endures nothing irregular* and maintains *an elegant order*." If so, then who has appointed its order and elegant movement? Who has assigned to the moon the appropriate time for each of its illuminations? Who has set the limits of the sun's course? Is it not the one commander of all things, as I said?[185] Why, then, do you distract those who marvel at these things from more truthful conceptions, bidding them not to pursue the vision of the divine but merely
[159]

[183] Rom 1:20.

[184] Ps-Plutarch, *Plac.* 1.6, 879f. Cyril quoted this passage above at *c. Iul.* 2.22.8–12.

[185] *c. Iul.* 2.53.1–13 is similar to Didymus, *Gen.* 3:9–12 (SC 233.214), who similarly uses the word ταξίαρχος ("commander") to describe God's role as Craftsman of the universe.

knowledge of heaven – that it is God, standing outside of alteration and mutability and all change, and is not defiled by corruption and generation, being by nature immortal and indestructible? How, tell me, can you say that the generated heaven is exempt from variation, alteration, and change? For if it has come to be at all, then it also has been moved, and this means variation and a change in condition, since the fact that it formerly did not exist has already been ascribed to it as a kind of privation. For if what has come to be arises from a state of nonexistence, its being called into existence would be understood as alteration and variation.[186] And since it is agreed that it has come to be, how could that which came to be exist beyond corruption?

2.54 Furthermore, how can that which is tyrannized by generation and corruption possibly be immortal by nature? And how can that which has been introduced at a moment in time possibly be eternal? Indeed, Plato clearly says, "Time came to be with heaven, in order that, having been begotten together, they might also be dissolved together, if perhaps their dissolution should ever come to pass."[187] How then can that which is dissolved be immortal by nature? And how can that which owes its preservation from corruption solely to the Craftsman's will possibly be indestructible? For in such beings it is in fact not their nature that possesses an unshakeable permanence, nor is the firm grounding each one has in [160]
its natural state a quality of the nature itself; rather, they are assisted in this matter by acts of will from the one who maintains them.

He next says, "*it is either carried in a circle around the great Craftsman due to a greater and more divine soul indwelling it or, having received its motion from God himself (in the same way, I think, our bodies have)*." "But, good sir," I would respond, "that being who, according to you, is ungenerated, incorruptible, and indestructible, the immutable and unchangeable heaven which is pure of all defilement, which you actually say is even eternal – what kind of greater and more divine soul manages it? If there is some aspect of that soul that is superior to heaven, and if there is something greater and more excellent than the God who made it, I cannot imagine what it would be. As for my own view, I think that God's

[186] In the following century, John Philoponus would make similar statements: "for generation is a shift from nonbeing to being, and perishing from being to not being" (*de Aet.* 9.5, 334–35; trans. Share 2005, 27); "we conceive of nonbeing not as a kind of existence, but only as privation of being" (*de Aet.* 1.5, 15; trans. Share 2005, 27). Aristotle similarly remarked, "That which is capable of formerly not having existed is generated" (*Cael.* 1.12, 281b28).

[187] Plato, *Ti.* 38b. This passage was also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.32.3; Theodoret, *Affect.* 4.42.6; John Philoponus, *De aet.* 5.4, 117. Cyril's version differs slightly from that found in these other sources.

ineffable nature is full of the supreme glory. If we should indeed say that God is incorruptible, indestructible, beyond variation and alteration, ungenerated, eternal, free of every defilement, possessing pure perfection and standing in need of nothing whatsoever, then what have you reserved for that soul when you glorify the nature of things made with such bril-
[161] liant and preeminent honors?"

2.55 Nevertheless, "*the Hebrews*," Julian says, "*when thinking*[188] *about matters pertaining to heaven, say it is God's throne and the earth is his footstool*."[189] Correct, my good fellow! For I will mention that God himself said through one of the holy prophets, "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is the footstool for my feet. What sort of house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what will be my place of rest?"[190] Although he does not say that the heaven is God, he does compare it to God's throne and indeed also the earth to his footstool.

And if someone wanted to learn the reason for this description, it would not be difficult for us to respond with a truthful answer. For the most wise Solomon built in Jerusalem that renowned temple, but the communities of the Jews took great delight in it and thought the God of the universe dwelt in it as though he were contained within it. For they were nearly always slow to understand and without any expertise in theology.[191] Thinking that Jerusalem was even God's city, they used to maintain earnestly that he dwelt there and there alone, due to what had been said by the voice of David, "Glorious things were spoken about you, O city of God."[192] It is for this reason that God reproves those
[162] people who were entertaining such petty ideas[193] and says, "What sort of house will you build for me when I have the heaven as my throne and the earth as my footstool?" For it was necessary, yes necessary indeed, that those who assumed his nature was confined and circumscribed by place should be clearly shown that he is everywhere and that, while nothing contains him, he is instead present throughout all space and that, while the heaven is full of him, the earth is filled by him as well.[194]

[188] Gk.: δοξάζοντες, which could also be translated as "glorifying."

[189] This sentence is *c. Gal.* fr. 12 Mas. (omitted by Wright, following Neumann). Cyril is probably reporting an idea that Julian expressed in his treatise, but, as noted in the GCS apparatus, it is doubtful whether he is here quoting him word for word. Cf. Celsus' take on the view of heaven among the Jews at Origen, *Cels*. 5.6.

[190] Isa 66:1. [191] Gk.: τῶν περὶ θεοῦ λόγων. [192] Ps 86(87):3.

[193] As in the last paragraph, the verb here is again δοξάζω ("entertaining such petty ideas" for σμικρὰ … δοξάζοντας), which picks up on the δεδοξασμένα ("glorious things") in the psalm passage just cited.

[194] *c. Iul.* 2.55.9–24 was excerpted and included in the catena tradition on Acts. Cf. Cramer 1844, 111: 125.30–126.12.

2.56 Moreover, the fact that the heaven has been generated could easily be shown with many more testimonies from the God-breathed scripture. For God in one place said, "With my hand I made the heaven firm, and I commanded all the stars."[195] In addition, the blessed David says, "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established and by the Spirit of his Mouth all their power exists."[196] And he knew that the heavens also "declare the glory of God."[197] How or in what way do they do this? In light of the fact that they exist and have been generated, they are a wonderful source of amazement, and well-nigh employ a voice that expresses itself like this. For the best and most excellent things that have been skillfully devised, although they do not have a voice, nevertheless loudly proclaim the knowledge of the one who fashioned them by revealing it in themselves.

[195] Isa 45:12.

[196] Ps 32(33):6. Unlike most of Cyril's biblical citations, this one and the next are given in *oratio obliqua*.

[197] Ps 18(19):2. The word "glory" in the citation is δόξαν, which could also refer to the correct "view" about God that one can form on the basis of the created realm.

Book 3

[163] **3.1** Julian has, therefore, slandered all the habits, customs, and mysteries of Christians, and there is not one thing done well or even said correctly in the God-breathed scripture that he does not unabashedly surround with accusations for the purpose of debasing it. He exults only in those things that would naturally cause no small amount of distress to the truly intelligent and lead them to turn to a better course. And, just as unreservedly, he is in awe of Plato's speech, which he has appropriated for himself in order to defame the divine and supernatural glory.

As though he were "adding sin upon sin,"[1] Julian again makes an attack against the writing of Moses and sharpens his tongue against it;[2] or rather, he "lifts his horn aloft and speaks injustice against God"[3] and arms
[164] himself against the doctrines of truth, when he speaks as follows:

Julian

> *Compare to these [namely, the teachings of Plato] the Jewish teaching: the "paradise planted" by "God," Adam "formed" by him, and then the "woman" who was made for him. For God said: "It is not good that the man be alone; let us make for him an assistant like him"*[4] *– though she was of assistance to him in nothing at all but deceived him and became for both him and herself*
> [165] *jointly responsible for their fall from "the delight of paradise."*[5] *This is entirely mythical.*[6] *For how is it reasonable that God was unaware that the one created by him to be an "assistant" would be to the detriment rather than the advantage of him who received her?*[7]

[1] Isa 30:1. See also Sir 3:27; 5:5.

[2] Cyril seems to favor the metaphor of Julian "whetting" or "sharpening" (καταθήγει) his tongue against the Christians; the verb is also used for whetting one's appetite for sinful acts; see *c. Iul.* 3.15.12; 4.4.29.

[3] Ps 74(75):6. [4] Gen 2:8, 15, 18, 22. [5] Cf. Gen 3:23, 24.

[6] On Julian's view of the Bible and myth, see *c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.29) with note.

[7] *c. Gal.* fr. 13 Mas.; Wright 1923, 324–25. On Julian's criticism of Eve's supposed "assistance" to Adam and Cyril's reply, see Boulnois, SC 582, 567–69.

Cyril

3.2 He disbelieves, therefore, that "*a paradise was planted by God,*" or perhaps he unthinkingly condemns[8] the ineffable power as being unable to do this. And he makes the molding of Adam and the woman from him an opportunity for laughter and says that the God who knows not how to err in anything failed in his purpose and plan. "She did not," he says, "contribute to Adam's *advantage*," but rather to his "*deception*" and the loss of both "*paradise*" and "*delight*."

Do you then want us, dear sir, to abandon these things that you consider stale and follow the words of your teachers? Would you like us [166] to investigate what you along with your fathers have found marvelous by "comparing"[9] the cosmogony of Hesiod to that of Moses?

After invoking the Muses and asking from them "sweet song" (to use his own words),[10] he collected for us narratives of noisome nonsense. For he says that "Coeus and Hyperion" were born from Earth and Heaven, and besides them Iapetus, and from him came a certain Prometheus.[11] If he had not "stolen" fire "from Zeus,"[12] woman would not have come into being at all, she whom "the cripple"[13] – that is Hephaestus – made, and whom they say the "daughter of a mighty father"[14] – I mean Athena – beautified with varied "adornment" and gave to men as a "fair evil."[15] If so, then, since woman didn't yet exist, whom we [men] received because of the wrath of Zeus, as they themselves say, how could the human race have been established? Or how could the "gods of gods" otherwise have become craftsmen, "weaving together the mortal with the immortal" as Plato supposes?[16]

They have not felt any sense of dread at trotting out these stories against the writings of the all-wise Moses; and yet shouldn't one instead burst into praise from a sound mind? [167]

3.3 But perhaps they might say that the law of poetic expertise[17] allows the poets to construct myths without being blamed for them.[18] Well then, if they produced nothing essential for us, all of their poetry should be disbelieved and called myths, nonsense, and the

[8] Literally, "casts a negative vote," maintaining the judicial language called for by Julian's own forensic framing of the debate with Christians in *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.7).
[9] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 13.1 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.1.15). [10] Hesiod, *Th.* 104. [11] Hesiod, *Th.* 132ff.
[12] Hesiod, *Th.* 565ff and *Op.* 50ff.
[13] Hesiod, *Th.* 571, 579 (but also a common epithet for Hephaestus in Homer; e.g., *Il.* 1.607).
[14] Hesiod, *Th.* 587. [15] Hesiod, *Th.* 585.
[16] Plato, *Ti.* 41d1–2. Quoted already at *c. Gal.* fr. 9.32–33 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33.18–19).
[17] Gk.: τῆς ἐπιστήμης ὁ νόμος. [18] On poetic license, see *c. Iul.* 2.25.22–29 with note.

mutterings[19] of old women; even if there is some discourse about the gods in it, this, too, should be left behind and designated poetic witticism.

But they would not agree to take it in this way – indeed far from it. For they have a different attitude, claiming that the poets' descriptions of the gods are not mere artful speech and myth. Instead, they accept their words as trustworthy and true, and even the most intelligent do so. For instance, Herodotus, who composed a renowned history, said at one point the following: "I think Hesiod and Homer lived 400 years before me and no more. They were the ones who composed an account of the origins of the gods for the Greeks; they assigned names to the gods, distributed honors and areas of specialty to them, and indicated their appearance. The poets said to be earlier were, it seems to me, actually later than these men."[20] So then, if those poets who named the gods, gave them honors and names, and established their appearance have
[168] composed myths for them and nothing else, then they should reasonably be ridiculed and their nonsense and inanities should merit no consideration. But if, on the contrary, [the poets] are honored among them – and if indeed even up to the present day they say that those named [by the poets] are gods – why in vain do they indict them for speaking foolish nonsense when [the poets] of course say something discordant with their views? If they consider the poets trustworthy when they are writing about the gods, why do they insult them by disbelieving the rest of their words?

3.4 One could show through his own words – and this quite easily – that their revered Plato did not think Hesiod's *Theogony* objectionable.[21] For he spoke thus:

> "But it is impossible to escape the notice of the gods or to use force against them."[22] Well then, if they do not exist or are unconcerned about human affairs, we for our part[23] must nonetheless practice escaping their notice. But, if they do exist and are concerned for us, we know and have heard

[19] Gk.: ψελλίσματα; cf. the "prattling" (τερετίσματα) of women below at *c. Iul.* 3.20.10 or Cyril's preferred word for old women's talk: "twittering" (ψιθυρισμός) at *c. Iul.* 3.7.18; 4.21.27; 7.12.17; 7.13.5; *Ador.* 1; 6 (PG 68.205b; 469b).

[20] Herodotus 2.53.2. With the exception of the last sentence, this passage of Herodotus was already quoted by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 17.1.

[21] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.4, where Cyril, in contrast, highlights Plato's criticism of Homer's deities.

[22] We have followed the GCS editors in enclosing this sentence with quotation marks, although they are only comprehensible in the larger context of that portion of Plato's dialogue (where the speaker Adeimantus offers possible objections to the position he is articulating, followed by his responses to them; the quotation marks here mark off one of these possible objections).

[23] Cyril's version of the Platonic passage at this point agrees with mss AD of the *Republic*; it is only in ms F of the *Republic* that we find the addition of the crucial τί, which might make better sense of this otherwise confused sentence ("*why* should we be concerned to escape their notice"; note

> that they are like this from no other source than the poets' stories and genealogies. These same poets say that the gods can be persuaded to be present at "sacrifices and gentle prayers"[24] and votive offerings.[25]

See then how Plato has clearly conceded that if the gods exist at all one must gain knowledge and learn from what others have written about them. It would certainly be clear that he has honored Hesiod's tale about the gods when he furthermore writes the following: [169]

> Oceanus and Tethys were born as children of Earth and Heaven, and from them came Phorkys, Cronus and Rhea […] Zeus, Hera and all the others whom we know are said to be their brothers.[26]

3.5 Is it not clear to everyone that precisely in those passages where their argument is too weak to advocate for the obscenity of their teachings, there they straightaway ascribe to the poets' artful speech the need to fashion myths and they mischievously accept only the tales about their gods? Why then, Your Excellency, shall we give up the woman fashioned by God and the story about her as though it were inelegant and accept instead Hesiod's Pandora? Does doing this seem best to you?

But Julian is perhaps saying that God's actions regarding her were a mistake: "She was made as an assistant and to be for some benefit to the man, but she did none of these things. On the contrary, she is seen to contribute a not insignificant loss '*both for herself and for him*.' For both of them fell away '*from the delight of paradise*' and have gone very far from any superiority over death and corruption."[27]

Someone could respond to such claims by precisely applying their mind to the oracles of the God-breathed scripture. It is true that the woman was made for the purpose of assistance.[28] But, it is necessary and [170]

also the different verbal adjective "be concerned," which all mss of the *Republic* share in contrast to Cyril's "must practice"). On the other hand, Cyril's rendering allows for a consistently negative depiction of this polytheistic articulation, regardless of the theological option one chooses: if the gods are unconcerned with humans, we must nonetheless [irrationally] try to avoid them; if they are concerned with us, then we can placate them through sacrifices.

[24] Homer, *Il.* 9.499.

[25] Plato, *R.* 2.365d6–e6; the last clause was very loosely alluded to at Clement, *Str.* 7.3.15.1 (οὔτε θυσίαις οὐδὲ μὴν ἀναθήμασιν); in Cyril's own reading of Clement, he would only have recognized the Platonic allusion if he had already read the Platonic passage independently.

[26] Plato, *Ti.* 40e5–41a2. *Ti.* 40d6–41a3 is also cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.7.1–2; 13.1.1–2; 13.14.5.

[27] What is included in quotation marks here is Cyril's paraphrase of Julian rather than a verbatim citation; for the relevant fragment, see *c. Gal.* fr. 13 Mas. For the distinctively Cyrillian phrase "superior to death and corruption," see *c. Iul.* 3.24.13–14 and 3.27.19.

[28] The GCS edition (but not Boulnois) encloses this and the following sentence in quotation marks, as what one might say against Julian's critique. We have instead followed Boulnois in omitting quotation marks, since the "I suppose" of the second sentence would seem more naturally appropriate of Cyril's own voice than that of his hypothetical respondent.

quite reasonable, I think, to investigate[29] the type of assistance for which she was created. For in this way we shall release the Craftsman from Julian's indictment. The woman was in fact not taken as a partner in his[30] purpose or plan; and she was allotted passage into existence by a verdict of God[31] who knows all, [but] not in order that she might by nature have immutability[32] and an ingrained inability ever to diverge from the Lord's will.[33] For the rational creature is governed by voluntary choices, darting towards the good and its opposite with voluntary inclinations.[34] Instead, she was taken for the purpose of assistance so as to aid in the bearing of children; for it was said to both of them, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth."[35]

3.6 For the other animals had already been brought into existence, I mean land animals, birds, and water animals; and indeed, the race [of animals] had hopes of being able to become a countless multitude, for there were both male and female among them. But the man lacked something "like him,"[36] that is, something similar to him in nature, through which the bearing of his children would necessarily become abundant in
[171] equal measure to the other animals.

Look here for me at the female brought into existence wisely and expertly according to what God deemed fitting.[37] For although he was able to start afresh also in her case and to take "the dust from the ground"[38] and fashion her in the same manner as Adam himself was created, he did not do so; rather, wanting to implant in the man an inclination for her, God took a small part of the man, and having interwoven[39] the rest he brought forth a woman well-suited to the principles of the man's nature.[40] The man accepted her gladly and, aroused to love

[29] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖσθαι.

[30] The "purpose and plan" could be that of God (as at *c. Iul.* 3.2.5; cf. Gen 2:16–17); Boulnois understands it to be the man's (Adam's) "purpose and plan" (see her translation *ad loc.*) possibly because it seems more natural to understand the woman as a partner to the man than to God. We have maintained Cyril's ambiguity.

[31] For this phrase, cf. *c. Iul.* 5.20.36, which had been considered by Andrew Smith to be a continuation of a fragment of Porphyry (*ad Nemert.* fr. 278 Smith); see, however, Boulnois, SC 582, 505 n. 3.

[32] Cf. Porphyry, *Libr. arbitr.* fr. 268.23 Smith.

[33] We depart from the GCS, which has a neuter singular dative article introducing this articular infinitive (found in mss B^4Q) and have instead followed Boulnois in adopting the accusative form of the article (found in mss FME), thus taking ἀραρός ("fixed") as a predicate modifying the articular infinitive; see Boulnois, SC 582, 164 n. 1.

[34] On the notion of free inclinations (ῥοπαῖς), see Origen, *Princ.* 3.1.5; Plotinus 4.8[6].5.26; Porphyry, *Sent.* 4; *Libr. arbitr.* fr. 271.19 Smith; with Johnson 2015, 193, 195.

[35] Gen 1:28. [36] Gen 2:18. [37] Cf. Augustine *C. D.* 12.22. [38] Gen 2:7.

[39] Gk.: προσυφήνας. This verb marks an allusion to Plato, *Ti.* 41d.

[40] *c. Iul.* 3.6.8–15 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 846.

by natural stirrings and all but embracing her, says "This is now bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh; she will be called woman because she was taken from her man."[41] Therefore, God implanted in the nature of males a natural connection – I mean for the female – since human affairs would be arranged best if those joined in lawful harmony were disposed towards their wives in the same way as Adam. [172]

3.7 Accordingly, the meaning of the "assistance" brought to Adam by his wife should reasonably be understood in terms of the manner of reproduction. If it was possible for reproduction to be accomplished in a different way, let Julian tell us what it was and prove it, and I will be silent. But if human reproduction could not happen unless the matter involved both, I mean both father and mother, why does he jump on us for no good reason and, being addicted to slander, dare to disparage things done rightly in this manner, which proceed, so to speak, along a straight path? Let him, therefore, release the Craftsman from the indictment; for he has not at all shown that he erred in his plans in the case of the female.

"This is true," he says, "but nevertheless she did not give good counsel when she seduced Adam to consider as worthless the command given [about the forbidden fruit]."[42] Yes, admittedly she became a poor counselor – I will hardly deny the truth. But, if he has some complaint against the laws of nature or censures God's actions as not done well, let Julian show us the charges for which someone might indict God for straying from his purpose. If, on the other hand, this is in fact madness and a clear proof of the utmost insanity, why does Julian say that God was mistaken? And why would he make this accusation if, furthermore, the female was brought by the whisperings[43] of another [i.e., the snake] to choose to do what was wrong, although human reason has received the power over what should and shouldn't be done and, as I said,[44] has been [173] allowed to pursue any course of action whatsoever by its voluntary inclinations, since God who is the best artisan of all thought that this too was right? For it was necessary that the rational creation be honored with the capacity for voluntary action and that its readiness in good works be revealed as the fruit of free choice.

[41] Gen 2:23.

[42] The material in quotation marks is not taken by the editors or Masaracchia as a legitimate fragment of Julian, but rather as the constructed hypothetical answer of Cyril's interlocutor in diatribe style.

[43] Gk.: ψιθυρισμοῖς, elsewhere translated by us as "twitterings" for old women's talk, in parallel with "mutterings" (ψελλίσματα at *c. Iul.* 3.3.4–5) or "prattling" (τερετίσματα at *c. Iul.* 3.20.10); see note at *c. Iul.* 3.3.4–5 above.

[44] See *c. Iul.* 3.5.26.

3.8 These things seemed to be worthy of all praise even to Julian's teachers. Porphyry, for example, in his book *To Nemertius* speaks thus:

> Now God wanted humans also to be partakers of the truth about reality; for this reason, he also made them rational since reason would be capable of tracking down the truth.[45] And he also has given freedom and free will to each person, so that the beauty adorned with praise because of its voluntary nature might be up to them.[46] But many people, turning aside towards irrationality and a lack of reasoning arising from their laziness, have fallen into a beastly manner of life and have been mistaken with respect to reality; since even a sober-minded person, by the virtue of hard work, can scarcely maintain the truth about these things.[47]

And indeed, elsewhere he also writes:

> Free will belongs to the soul which has received the possession of
> [174] freedom[48] for the purpose of [exhibiting] virtue or the voluntary choice of vice, in order that praiseworthiness and blameworthiness might be assessed in the case of each individual soul, and that there might be room among humans for approbation, praise and due rewards – as well as censure, dishonor and punishment for those who chose to perform deeds

[45] The metaphor of hunting for truth, ultimately drawn from Plato, seems to have been favored by Porphyry more than other Platonists of his time; cf. *ad Nemert*. fr. 279 (at. *c. Iul.* 5.21.16–17); *Philol. Recit*. fr. 408.80; *c. Boeth*. fr. 242.22; *Antr*. 4.5, 21; *Sent*. 43.11; *in Ptol.* p.195.13; 212.29. For its occurrence in Plato, see esp. *Leg*. 2.654e3, 5.728d1; *Prm*. 128c1; *Phdr*. 252e7; and for the hunting metaphor more generally, see *Sph*. 218d3 and passim. Among the later Platonists, see Plotinus 1.4.2.36, 38; Iamblichus, *Comm.Math.* 67.14; *De anima* 7.13; Proclus, *Comm. Tim.* 3.14.16; *in Parm*. 3, p.815.13; 5, p.1007.19; Eunapius, *VS* 2.1.8; 5.1.15); it is adopted by some Christians as well (such as the Cappadocians, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Isidore of Pelusium).

[46] Porphyry had written an entire treatise entitled *On What Is up to Us*, which defended a notion of free will.

[47] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 276 Smith; fragments of this otherwise unattested work are preserved only by Cyril in *c. Iul.* Nemertius is otherwise unknown. The PLRE entry (1.621) notes, without foundation, that Nemertius is "presumably a disciple" of Porphyry. It is unclear whether the πρός in the title Πρὸς Νημέρτιον (if, that is, it should even be taken as a reference to the title rather than merely a description of the contents of this portion of a larger work) should be taken in the adversative sense ("Against Nemertius") or in the more ambiguous sense ("To Nemertius"), as we have taken it in the translation (although the latter still allows for the former sense and probably should be taken in that way if the *logos* described in fr. 278 Smith [= *c. Iul.* 5.20.32] is meant to designate a written composition by Nemertius himself). For a somewhat different account of the effects of hard work on the pursuit of purification of the body, see Porphyry, *Phil. Orac.* fr. 324.2–4 Smith.

[48] Gk.: ἐλευθεριότητος. Although the term usually designates "liberality" in the classical period (as well as later antiquity; e.g., Porphyry, *in Cat.* 137.1; Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1358.1), in contexts such as the present one it can be taken to refer to "freedom" of the will (see e.g., Epiphanius, *Anc.* 52.3; Titus of Bostra, *Man.* 2.8, 9, 11), although the occurrence in this fragment of Porphyry may be the only instance of this usage in a non-Christian author. We thus follow Smith's note *ad loc.*, who takes it as "freedom" (*libertatem*); for an alternative view, see Boulnois, SC 582, 570, with a lucid presentation of the textual problems of this sentence at 569–71.

> of injustice. Wise men say that souls choose the life that each wants,[49] having the ability to do so from [God's] providence.[50]

3.9 Does our account seem to you to fall short of the truth? Or will you agree with your own teachers and yourself admit that this is how things are? If Julian thinks that he needs still more testimonies on this subject, I shall present him with the words of Alexander, a man who was one of the most subtle and precise among them. For in his book *On Providence* he said,

> Someone might see the goodwill of the divine nature towards us also in the following. Since it was impossible for the virtues to be in us by nature, the divine nature, by granting us the power over which it is the master, made the acquisition of the virtues up to us and no one else, in order that what we could not have from it we might be able to get by ourselves as though from it.
>
> If then we were able to possess virtues by our nature there would be no room left for vice. But since this is impossible – since our nature only goes so far as our being able to receive the virtues – everything that is receptive of something to which there is an opposite, is necessarily also receptive of its opposite.[51] [175]

Again, Alexander said in his *On Fate*,

> We don't see everyone or even the majority of people possessing the virtues – which is an indication of what is natural – but must content ourselves with perhaps just one such person who exhibits through training and teaching the natural superiority of humans in comparison with the other animals, having supplemented on his own what is necessarily lacking in our nature. For this reason, the acquisition of the virtues is up to us, and it is neither useless nor pointless to give praise or blame, or encourage one towards what is better, or to guide one through better habits that are in accord with the laws.[52]

3.10 Therefore, someone who has chosen to think rightly will not at all doubt that the God of the universe must be entirely free[53] of the charge of not planning well in the fashioning of humanity, even if some may have become disobedient, since, as I said, the inclination and

[49] Probably a general reference to the Myth of Er in the tenth book of Plato's *Republic*, on which Porphyry had much to say in his *On What Is up to Us*; see *Libr.arbit.* frs. 268–71 Smith.
[50] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 277 Smith.
[51] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 5 Riedweg (= fr. 2 Grant; absent in the Arabic version); on the Greek fragments of this work (found only in Cyril), see *c. Iul.* 2.38–39 with note.
[52] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De fato* 27, p.53.17–54.2 Thillet.
[53] The wording here marks an allusion to Plato, *R.* 10.617e5.

permission to choose anything whatsoever has been allotted to them as a rudder and they have willingly tended towards what is outside the law and discordant with it. For continual happiness would no doubt have been theirs in every way if they had observed the law that had been given. But since they were carried off towards apostasy, their hopes were
[176] immediately disappointed and they were brought down to a more shameful condition and, even more, to everything that would naturally cause grief.

Julian

"But why did God even legislate anything at all," he says,[54] *"and scare them away from something they could eat? For he commanded 'to eat from every tree' excluding only the one 'in the middle of paradise.'*[55] *But no offense would have occurred if no law or commandment had been passed. If he is good why did he*
[177] *punish them?"*[56]

Cyril

Since, therefore, the God who is beyond all "*is good*," tell me, would it be appropriate for us to disregard what comes from him, and shall we despise it with impunity? Indeed, such an attitude and way of thinking didn't even seem right to the wise men of the Greeks. For Plato once more said at one point: "According to an ancient account, God holds the beginning, end, and middle of all that exists, and completes in a straight course his circuit in conformity with nature; and Justice ever attends him as a punisher of those who abandon the divine law."[57] Thus, since "Justice attends" him "as a punisher," punishing with complete justice those who have chosen to despise the divine law, no one should think that because God "*is good*" it is necessary and proper for us to pursue with impunity everything that seems best to us. We should instead recognize that we are to fear his greatness, keeping in mind his preeminence over all things,

[54] Cyril's insertion of φησι here is out of step with his usual practice when quoting Julian and is no doubt related to the fact that he has not provided any introductory statement for the fragment, allowing Julian to enter into the debate with an objection as though he were a live interlocutor. Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.34.14; 9.21.11.

[55] Gen 2:16; 2:9, 3:3. [56] *c. Gal.* fr. 14 Mas.; omitted by Wright, following Neumann.

[57] Plato, *Leg.* 4.715e7–716a3. This Platonic passage was also cited by Clement, *Prot.* 69.4; *Str.* 2.132.2; Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.13.5; Theodoret, *Affect.* 6.26. The earlier portion of it was also cited by Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 25.4.

and to submit to his ordinances, making the neck of our reasoning tractable and easily guided by his reins.[58]

3.11 Would one not grant that it is especially proper for someone who is good not to acquiesce to vices? So how is it not true to say that the goad of the laws is sharpened not against the virtuous but rather against [178] those who have no desire to do good works and who reject the duty of living as a free person?[59] So then, people who have attached the mooring-lines of their reasoning to the virtues are in fact able to rely on the laws; if, that is, it is not to be doubted that [the laws] restrain that which is stubborn and by the threat of punishment hold in check that which inclines to apostasy, turning people towards the good and compelling those who have chosen to have no part in proper reasoning to leave behind what is rather shameful.

No thoughtful person would blame the laws themselves or those who have formulated them. For the laws are not responsible for the fact that those who are convicted of crimes necessarily suffer – since, although they could have chosen right thinking, they went off after what pleased them. Instead, they are caught in the act of destroying themselves.

3.12 If, therefore, Julian were to say that the God of the universe should not have laid down a law for the first humans in the beginning, he will hear in answer from us – and this quite reasonably: "Tell me, then, should humanity have been left unsupervised, completely free to roam unbridled, not knowing anything superior or even who the ruler is at all? And yet, complacency is nearly always accompanied by a state of instability and complete laxity, with a formidable tendency to cause confusion and to send a person veering off into wasting their energies; that which is under the yoke and control of the one assigned to rule, on the other hand, shows more moderation. In the same way that bridles are not useless for horses to know how to run well, which is a mark of honor [179] for them, nor likewise are rudders useless for ships – for by them they stay true to course[60] – so also law is not useless for humanity."

If Julian censures what I have said, then he admits it is pointless to issue laws, although he himself was a legislator. It would then be necessary, Your Excellency, for us even to remove judges from public

[58] For the rein-and-bridle metaphor, see e.g., *c. Iul.* 3.12.18–19; 3.37.2–3; 3.41.1; 4.6.23; 4.35.8; 4.38.23; 5.1.9 (quoting Jas 3:2); 5.1.10; 5.7.14; 5.10.1–2; 5.10.20–25 (quoting Ps 31[32]:9); 5.14.30; 5.20.22–23; 5.22.23.

[59] Cf. Porphyry, *Marc.* 25.384ff.

[60] As Boulnois notes (SC 582, 178), the two images of horses' bridles and ships' rudders are presented together in the New Testament, at Jas 3:3–4.

life, as well as the very fear that is most beneficial to habitual wrongdoers, I mean the fear of an inevitable punishment; or perhaps there would be nothing strange about removing children from the instruction of their parents! However, a horse would never run well without a bridle and rider, nor indeed would ships run straight on course if the one who knew how to steer them was removed, nor will a city earn the reputation for being administered in the best way without judges presiding over it, nor indeed is the instruction of parents useless for those who are still children. The presiding law is, therefore, in every way beneficial.

3.13 Let us, if it seems good to you, examine[61] the other parts of creation, to see if they are not yoked to the Craftsman's laws. The great and brilliant sun completes its proper course with due order, and indeed the moon also and the other stars; the hours come forth in orderly manner as day and night. From them, those who are willing can see that the creation proclaims its Orderer through its excellent order, and through its fine disposition all but shouts aloud that it yields to laws and is administered by the ineffable decisions of God, the best artisan of all things. Accordingly, the prophet David says in a psalm: "You made the moon for marking times, the sun knew its setting."[62] The God-breathed scripture is full of such testimonies.

[180]

However, confirmation from those who hold the same opinions as Julian will perhaps persuade him or rather put him on the right path, even if he is unwilling. So then, Alexander, an illustrious man, speaks as follows in his book *On Providence*:

> Nothing in the universe happens without providence. For all things are full of the divine and it pervades all of reality. For this reason, too, all that comes to be happens according to God's will […].[63]
>
> This is confirmed also by what is seen. For the order of that which comes to be by nature, ever remaining in a similar condition, is a great proof of the fact that these things do not happen by chance.[64]

[181]

[61] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσωμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[62] Ps 103(104):19.

[63] In comparison with the Arabic version of Alexander's work (since a full Greek text of this treatise is no longer extant), not only does Cyril or his source change an originally plural "gods" to the singular but he (or his source) also omits the second part of the sentence ("insofar as they [the gods] care for things and lead each one of them"); see the GCS apparatus *ad loc*.

[64] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 1 Riedweg (= fr. 3a Grant = vers.arab. D18, p.87 Thillet). The first sentence of this fragment is given in *oratio obliqua* (according to the Arabic version of the text, Alexander himself had given this sentence in *oratio obliqua*; see the GCS apparatus *ad loc.*). On the Greek fragments of this work (found only in Cyril), see *c. Iul.* 2.38–39 with note.

Moreover, in another passage:

> Aristotle says that the preservation and birth of things here, and the eternal continuation of their species do not occur without divine providence. For the power from the sun and from the other stars that are the sun's companions, according to him, possesses the cause of the birth and preservation of things established by nature.[65] [182]

Therefore, from the good order in the visible phenomena and their harmonious movement it should be apparent that they are yoked to the laws of their Ruler. For, it says, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament announces the work of his hands."[66]

3.14 If someone with the innermost eyes of their mind should leap up above the nature of perceptible things, and if they are carried beyond everything visible and investigate the intelligible and knowable creation, he shall find that it, too, is administered by appropriate laws, and is obedient, compliant, and entirely dedicated to the God over all. For angels and archangels serve and honor him with unending praises, possessing a genuine sense of devotion to the power of his glory. Accordingly, the divine prophet Isaiah says that he "saw the Lord Sabaoth sitting upon a lofty and exalted throne, and the Seraphim stood about him in a circle,"[67] and they were singing hymns antiphonally in response to each other. And David likewise sings a psalm and says: "Bless the Lord all his angels, you who are powerful in might, doing his word in order to [183] listen to the sound of his words; bless the Lord all his powers, his servants doing his will."[68]

3.15 Accordingly, it is undeniable that the giving of the law to the first humans by God hardly proved to be detrimental to them – far from it! – but rather turned out to convey the utmost benefit and provided them with exceptional goods. And if it seems to anyone that I am not putting the truth first here, let him look at the matter from the facts themselves: for there were a great number of trees in Paradise and he commanded that all of them should be used for food but only the one "in the middle"[69] should be avoided.

"And yet," someone might say, "it was perhaps more beneficial to have put the tree that they were prohibited from eating at the edges of Paradise, perhaps even in places they did not know, so that it would not

[65] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 3 Riedweg (= fr. 3b Grant = vers.arab. D18, p.105 Thillet).
[66] Ps 18(19):2. [67] Isa 6:1–2. [68] Ps 102(103):20–21. [69] Gen 2:9; 3:3.

constantly be seen and thus whet the viewers' appetites towards desiring it." What shall we say to this? The plan[70] to ensure that the tree would not escape their notice was put forward with the greatest foresight and skill, since God was the tree's maker. For it was necessary, yes it was necessary that those who looked upon the tree should constantly be called to remembrance of the law by the tree itself and recognize the
[184] preeminence of their Ruler and not be ignorant that he was a lawgiver and Lord.[71] And, from another perspective, the requirement that they, for a time, practice docility in such small matters and intensely exercise self-control would not have failed to contribute something beneficial to them.

3.16 In addition to this, it will be necessary, I think, to say the following. For it was also highly likely that, because they always saw the tree and were not able to ignore the law about it, they were always called to remembrance of the God who gave the command and thus leapt up to contemplate him. By raising their thought above earthly affairs, they wisely considered who had given the command and how great he was. Nothing could have been more precious than the true contemplation of God, if indeed such activity implants within us participation in complete blessedness. Accordingly, our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was discoursing with God, the heavenly Father, said, "This is eternal life: that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you sent."[72] And indeed, the all-wise Moses also
[185] begged God when he was longing to obtain such knowledge, saying: "If I have found favor with you, show yourself to me; may I see you intelligibly."[73] For Israel, and Moses along with them, had seen God, but it was more with their bodily perception and not yet "intelligibly," since God "descended" in the form "of fire on Mt. Sinai."[74] Christ has confirmed that the divine and ineffable nature is not actually known as fire nor would it ever be subject at all to vision, when he spoke to the Jews about God the Father: "You have neither heard his voice nor seen his form."[75] For only by way of God's accommodation[76] was the divinity given shape in fire.[77]

[70] Gk.: οἰκονομία.

[71] *c. Iul.* 3.15.9–18 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 846–48. Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.8.11–14, where Cyril says imperial officials erect images of the emperors in private and public spaces to ensure that their subjects always call to mind their sovereign.

[72] John 17:3. [73] Exod 33:13. [74] Exod 19:18, 20. [75] John 5:37. [76] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς.

[77] Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.7.16–8.8.8.

3.17 Moreover, the fact that the precise vision of God would provide to those who are worthy to seize it the happiness[78] that surpasses all other forms of happiness is something that can be shown also from the books written by those who think differently from ourselves. For Alexander, whom we just mentioned, again said,

> It is not right to pass over the following thing either, which has itself also been given by divine providence to humanity, and which we mentioned briefly in what was already said before. And it is this: that the pinnacle of our happiness[79] lies in piety towards the divine, such that we do not expect any external rewards for this reason from it, but that we obtain the supreme good in service to it. [186]
>
> Therefore, it is agreed that happiness for humans chiefly rests in contemplation. For this activity belongs to the most honorable of the soul's faculties, namely the intellectual faculty. For the true knowledge of the most excellent things in existence is contemplation. And the most excellent things of all that exist are divine. Our happiness is thus in the knowledge of divine things.[80]

So then, given that "happiness" lies "in the contemplation" "of divine things," something that even those who share Julian's opinions and superstition themselves say, how can anyone not greatly admire the God of the universe who gave to the first humans the law about the tree as a springboard for focusing on the divine?[81] The tree had also been planted "in the middle of Paradise" because it was necessary that those seeing it be called very frequently to the remembrance of the law and that through the law they should in a way always imagine the preeminence and the exceptional beauty of the one who had implemented it.

[78] Gk.: εὐημερίας; Cyril may be intentionally avoiding the classic word for "happiness" (which itself is an imperfect term of translation), namely εὐδαιμονία, which Alexander of Aphrodisias uses in the following quotation, because of its literal sense of being well-treated by a daemon or having a good daemon attend upon one (a point made explicit by Sextus Empiricus, *M.* 7.49: εὐδαίμων ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ εὖ τὸν δαίμονα διακείμενον ἔχων; cf. Clement, *Paed.* 2.1.15.4; *Str.* 2.22.131.4; Alcinous, *Didasc.* 28.3). Indeed, a search of Cyril's entire corpus reveals that εὐδαιμονία and its cognates occur only in *c. Iul.* and here only in quotations (or references to quotations) of his pagan sources.

[79] Gk.: εὐδαιμονίαν.

[80] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 6 Riedweg (= fr. 4 Grant; absent in the Arabic version); see Riedweg 2011, 288–90. A quotation from Alexander at *c. Iul.* 5.9.4–10 (= fr. 7 Riedweg) has similar content and, in part, wording, but may be from a different work of his; see Boulnois, SC 582, 118–20. On the Greek fragments of this work (found only in Cyril), see *c. Iul.* 2.38–39 with note.

[81] Gk.: θεοπτίας ἀφορμήν. Cyril's choice of this word may be influenced by the Neoplatonic adoption of it, e.g., by Porphyry as the title for his *Springboard to the Intelligible Realm* (Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητά, given the Latin title *Sententiae*); see Goulet 2005, which enumerates earlier philosophical and rhetorical works with this title. It has not been noticed that Porphyry could have been evoking Plato's use of the simple noun at *R.* 6.511b5: οἷον ἐπιβάσεις τε καὶ ὁρμάς.

3.18 Accordingly, insofar as the Craftsman's goal was concerned, one can see that the female did not become a source for any loss or harm to her husband; and indeed, we hold that the pure Intellect that surpasses all things was not unaware of what would happen. On the contrary, he knows "all things before their generation,"[82] but permits human affairs to
[187] go with the flow, so to speak, precisely because it is apparent that the decision of whether or not to do any given thing hangs upon each person's choice.[83]

Now, given that God is good and his invariable inclination is to hate everything that participates in inappropriate conduct and is remiss in its duties, someone might for this reason determine that it would have been better if he had not permitted certain people to come into existence from the outset. But if we followed this line of reasoning, then it seems to me we would have to blame him not only for the first humans, but also for a great many other people, or rather for all those who were born after them and who, right up to our own day, are lax and sinful and who habitually disregard the divine laws.[84]

Nevertheless, the wise thing to do, in my view, would be to ascribe to him and him alone the knowledge of all things and the administration of our affairs in whatever way he chooses, and to be fully convinced that everything is correct and blameless.[85] To censure him about anything at all brings with it an indictment for the most serious impiety. For as the prophet Isaiah says: "Who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?"[86] And the prophet David, too, is most correct to cry aloud and say to him: "Your path is in the sea, and your ways are in
[188] many waters, your steps shall not be known."[87] For it is difficult for humans to see, or rather it would be entirely beyond the reach of our sight[88] to behold the plan and will of the sovereign God with respect to each one of our affairs and also the very path he takes to carry them out.

3.19 I shall add to what I have said the agreement of Julian's own teachers in this matter. For once more, Porphyry said the following:

> for, since that which presides over the universe is a divine Intellect ordering and administering everything with the surpassing greatness of its wisdom and with the incomparable distinctiveness of its power, the human intellect, being small, fails to notice many causes even if it should

[82] Sus 42. [83] Gk.: προαιρέσεως.
[84] For a very similar argument, see Cyril, *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69.21b).
[85] Cyril's language here anticipates that of Porphyry's *ad Nemert.* fr. 281 Smith, quoted below at 3.19.
[86] Isa 40:13 = Rom 11:34. [87] Ps 76(77):20.
[88] For the phrase ἄποπτος παντελῶς, see *c. Iul.* 6.27.23.

> seem to be wise and a discoverer of truth. But[89] the pious thing is for us to abandon difficult investigation into impassable problems and not only to keep from daring[90] to blaspheme but also to think and say that things are good as they are and that it is because they are good that they have come to be in the manner that they have. For why would an Intellect of such greatness and character act contrary to its own law? But one must regard it as impermissible for our understanding to scrutinize what is good and for our lack of understanding to scrutinize what is bad.[91]

Accordingly, the requirement that one think and say that everything coming from God is done correctly would hardly be inconsistent with prudent considerations, but it is entirely unholy and abhorrent to want to meddle in things we cannot capture or, rather, outrun our finitude and intellect. [189]

3.20 But the all-wise Julian adds still other notions to what he has already said and continues without interruption the thread of his argument:

Julian

> *What sort of language shall we say the snake used when it conversed with Eve? Was it a human language? How are such stories any different from the myths*[92] *invented by the Greeks?*[93]

Cyril

See how he again censures the true accounts and claims they resemble "Greek *myths*." So then, he clearly knows that those stories he deems

[89] For the signal improvements to our understanding of the text of this sentence, which derive from a critical edition that corrects Migne's and thus Grant's and Smith's readings, see Riedweg and Oesterheld 1998, 424–26.

[90] For a discussion of daring (as well as the notion of acting contrary to law, mentioned later) in Porphyry's thought, see Johnson 2012b.

[91] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 281 Smith. This fragment is given in *oratio obliqua*, which may be due not to Cyril indirectly reporting Porphyry's words, but to Porphyry indirectly reporting the words of another, as suggested in passing by Riedweg and Oesterheld 1998, 424 n. 28.

[92] On Julian's view of the Bible and myth, see *c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.29) with note.

[93] *c. Gal.* fr. 15 Mas.; Wright 1923, 324–25. This critique of the snake's language in Genesis also arises in Ambrosiaster, *Quaest.* 31.3, on which see De Labriolle 1934, 495–96. Unnoticed by De Labriolle (who noted several comparisons between Julian and Celsus, 399–405), however, is the occurrence of a related critique by Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 4.36 (where he criticizes the fact that the snake opposed God's commands); see Perrone 1994, 161–85; Cook 2004, 73. The author of an anonymous anti-Jewish dialogue from the sixth century refers the critique to "certain Celsuses, Julians, and Porphyries" (*Dial. anon.* I.178–202), though it is impossible to verify that Porphyry, too, raised such a critique; for a thorough discussion, see Morlet 2008, with the special recognition that the problem of the snake's language was a commonplace by the time of Julian (p. 152).

worth pondering and regards as having religious power are myths and old wives' prattling,[94] nothing more. But actually, dear sir, we do not say this about the holy and God-breathed scripture. For there is no mythical element in it at all; rather, everything is filled with truth.

I am amazed that, although he is quite subtle and not inexperienced in
[190] teachings that he at least thinks and says are esoteric,[95] and although he sometimes even pushes his mind beyond the sensible realm, he fails to understand that the speech occurred by the activity of that wicked daemon who is the origin of evil, who was using the snake as a cloak for his own innate perversity.[96] For, although at that time there was no other animal that could speak, the female, due to her excessive simplicity, perhaps supposed that the capacity to use human speech had also been granted to other animals.[97]

Now Moses' account alone is more than sufficient for the required demonstration that it is not difficult for impure spirits to conduct these sorts of enterprises on occasion.[98] Since, however, it is likely that those who have chosen to hold the same mindset as that slanderer of Christianity[99] will be averse to concurring with our accounts, come let us prove the matter, insofar as possible, by busying ourselves[100] with their own histories.

So then, Homer, when he composed an account of the deeds of the Greeks at Troy, maintains that one of Achilles' horses (namely, Xanthus) prophesied his death and that the hero responded: "Xanthus, why do you prophesy my death?"[101] And Homer was hardly unconcerned with not giving the appearance of lying, since he said, "The white-armed goddess

[94] Gk.: τερετίσματα; cf. "mutterings" (ψελλίσματα) at *c. Iul.* 3.3.4–5 with note. One wonders whether Cyril noticed that Julian may have drawn his complaint about the snake's language from Celsus, who had also claimed that it was a myth like those that old women tell; see Origen, *Cels.* 4.36.13–14, cf. ibid. 4.39.

[95] As Boulnois notes (SC 582, 200 n. 2), this may be a reference to Julian's interest in theurgy; cf. Bouffartigue 1992, 43–44, 340–42, 633–34, 644–45; Smith 1995, 91–113, 122–24; Tanaseanu-Döbler 2013, 136–48.

[96] *c. Iul.* 3.20.18–19 (or perhaps 3.22.23–25) is alluded to in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 850.

[97] It is perhaps significant that Cyril here avoids the typically Alexandrian allegorical approach to this passage (see Philo, *Opif.* 156–57; *Leg.* 2.74; Origen, *Cels.* 4.39; Didymus, *Gen.* 3:14 [SC 233.224–30]) and instead opts for a more literal "Antiochene" interpretation of a daemon using a real snake (Boulnois SC 582, 200 n. 2 has noted Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2.28; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 16.2).

[98] *c. Iul.* 3.20.15–25 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 848–50.

[99] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

[100] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσαντες; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[101] Homer, *Il.* 19.420; no other Christian author cites this line of Homer or the line from the same passage cited in the next sentence. See Bartelink 1983.

Hera made the horse speak with a human voice."[102] Perhaps Julian will again make his usual objections and say that this is a case of poetic mythology.[103] But if this claim seems right to him, then he should accordingly denounce the deception of Homer's poems and he should bring an accusation against his own teachers. [191]

3.21 Nevertheless, we should busy ourselves[104] also with others who have composed similar accounts. Now, Porphyry, his partner[105] and the father of his verbal onslaught against us, at one point said the following while relating the life of Pythagoras:

> Because they are so popular, we shall omit the stories recorded about the dedication to Argive Hera at Mycenae of the shield of Euphorbus the Phrygian along with the spoils of Troy. But they say that the Caucasus River addressed him once when he was crossing it with many of his companions. With a sort of shrill and resounding cry the river called out, "Greetings, Pythagoras," while everyone listened on.[106]

But some people might, I suppose, respond that Porphyry said the river itself addressed him, not that it was a daemon that spoke. Fair enough. Then perhaps the water was capable of speech![107] But we, I think, would say this explanation comes from a deranged mind and is simply inconceivable. So then, it was a daemon who spoke and the fact that the river seemed to address him is proof of Pythagoras' sorcery.

"But this is untrue and instead exhibits an addiction to slander," [someone might say]. If, then, Pythagoras was not completely full of what the Greeks call ineffable wisdom, or rather magical skill,[108] let him be released from blame and we ourselves will be the ones speaking nonsense! But if he should be revealed to be a sorcerer, an enchanter, and a person skilled in such matters, isn't it true to say that the river's greeting to him was performed by the activity of one of the daemons connected to it? [192]

Once more, Porphyry writes about him as follows:

> Pythagoras did not take his walks with many people in a manner that would cause jealousy, but on the contrary, he would walk with one or two others, in the holy sites and sacred groves, choosing the most tranquil and beautiful places. He dearly loved his friends, being first to declare that "friends hold

[102] Homer, *Il.* 19.407. [103] On poetic license, see *c. Iul.* 2.25.22–29 with note.
[104] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[105] Since Porphyry was probably dead by 305, the partnership with Julian that Cyril here envisions is not personal but one of belonging to the same project of composing critiques of Christianity. See their pairing also at *c. Iul.* 3.31.8–9; 4.14.16–17; 8.50.1–4. For Julian's literary and intellectual relationship to Porphyry and the latter's notorious *Against the Christians*, see Bouffartigue 2011; Elm 2017.
[106] Porphyry, *VP* 27. [107] Gk.: λογικόν. [108] Cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 10.9.10–15.

> their possessions in common" and "a friend is another self." He would spend time with those who were healthy; he would take care of those whose bodies were ill and also comfort those whose souls were sick, some with incantations and magical arts and others with music, just as we said.[109]

And I suppose that saying the snake previously could not use a human voice is equivalent to saying the same about the Caucasus River, which found its voice thanks to the magician. And Clement who was most wise has mentioned Pythagoras in his *Stromateis*, saying: "Pythagoras was a devotee of Zoroaster the Persian, and those who belong to the school of Prodicus[110] boast in the fact that they acquired that man's secret books."[111] Now invariably they will say that the Magi are a Persian race. Moreover, no argument will release Zoroaster from the charge of being entangled in magical arts, and this is actually the person whose most excellent disciple
[193] they say was Pythagoras, so that some even boasted about the secret books he had composed.[112] So much for the reports of Porphyry and Clement.

3.22 Now Philostratus, when he was attempting to venerate the life of Apollonius with discriminating eloquence and was raising him to the pinnacle of all admiration, has him go to the very furthest edges of the land of Thebes. He said Apollonius made it to the very cataracts of the Nile River and spent time with the Gymnosophists there, who are themselves the very ones who know best how to practice sorcery. Then he says that the leader of them all – that is, Thespesion – spoke to Apollonius with the following exact words: "Since we are not incapable of being wise,[113]

[109] Porphyry, *VP* 32f.

[110] It seems likely that Clement is here referring not to the famous sophist of the classical period (Prodicus of Ceos) but to a little-known Gnostic of his own era (mentioned elsewhere by Clement at *Str.* 3.4.30; 7.7; cf. Tertullian, *Scorp*. 15; *adv. Prax.* 3). Porphyry refers to his own composition of refutations of a forged book of Zoroaster, which was in use among contemporary Christian/Gnostic groups; see *Plot.* 16.

[111] Clement, *Str.* 1.15.69.6. Note that, aside from biblical quotations, Clement is the first Christian author Cyril has quoted by name.

[112] Cyril makes two claims based upon Clement's testimony in order to prove that Pythagoras engaged in sorcery: 1) the Magi are Persian by race and thus, it is implied, Pythagoras' teacher, Zoroaster the Persian, must have belonged to the Magi – a point Cyril apparently needed to make, since it is oddly omitted from his quotation of Clement, which should have read "Pythagoras was a devotee of Zoroaster the Persian Magos," Ζωροάστρην δὲ τὸν Μάγον τὸν Πέρσην ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐζήλωσεν; 2) Zoroaster authored secret books that were still in the possession of later individuals who were, like Pythagoras, Greek philosophers (in fact, Pythagoras' Greek ethnicity is unstable in our sources; see Johnson 2013, 271–72). It may be of interest to note that Alexander Polyhistor (at *c. Iul.* 4.28.2–3, a source cited in Clement immediately after the sentence quoted here) has Zoroaster being "an Assyrian by race."

[113] Literally: "practicing sophistry," "being clever," or "doing tricks" (σοφίζεσθαι).

he said, 'You tree there' – it was an elm tree, the third from the one under which they were talking – 'speak to the wise Apollonius.' And the tree spoke to him as it was commanded; its voice was articulate and female."[114]

We shall also mention the oak of Dodona, which they say likewise has a human voice.[115] And indeed, Isigonus of Citium also says that the [194]
bull of Zeus on the island of Rhodes is not unable to engage in speech like us.[116]

Observe, therefore, how the trifles of those who practiced sorcery show quite well that the ability on occasion to produce voices is inherent to the nature of daemons and not only, in fact, voices from animals with perception, but even from things without sound and perception, namely water and trees. It is accordingly clear to everyone that the snake could not have conversed with the woman if it was alone and acting by itself, since it possesses a nature incapable of speech and thought; rather, it was Satan, the origin of evil, who adopted the snake's persona,[117] intending to rob humanity of the immortality granted it.[118] Would it not be entirely reasonable then for someone to find fault with Julian for failing to understand these things despite the fact that they nearly cry out with a loud voice against the wicked and unholy dragon? And I would add that, even if he himself refuses to believe, this by no means implies that the truth is unattainable; and he would rightly be ridiculed for not admitting the truth.

3.23 Having finished his argument on this topic as it pleased him, Julian again attacks the sacred scriptures like a hot-headed youth and says, [195]

[114] Philostratus, *VA* 6.10; cf. [Eusebius (?)], *Hierocl.* 31, 34, from which Cyril may have derived his knowledge of Philostratus' work, although the *Hierocl.* does not quote these lines and thus merely would have prompted Cyril (if he had even read that work at all) to return to the source, as suggested by Grant 1964, 272–73.

[115] On the oracle of Zeus at Dodona, see Homer, *Od.* 14.327–28 (and its later recollection at 19.296–97); Origen, *Cels.* 7.3, 6.

[116] Isigonus (otherwise known to be of Nicaea), *Paradox.*, fr. 22 Giannini; a fragment preserved uniquely by Cyril. Unfortunately, nothing else is known of Isigonus' discussion of the bull of Zeus or even which bull was the topic of his discussion (possibly the bull through which Zeus abducted Europa, which is usually not represented as speaking in the poets; or possibly the bronze bull of Phaleron, in which humans were roasted alive, as described by Diodorus Siculus 9.19.1; Origen, *Cels.* 4.67.13–17).

[117] Cyril here adopts the language of the stage; literally, "he put on its mask" (ὑπέδυ … τὸ … πρόσωπον).

[118] *c. Iul.* 3.22.23–25 (or perhaps 3.20.18–19) is alluded to in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 850.

Julian

Is it not excessively strange that God prohibits the humans he fashioned from discerning good and evil?[119] *What would be more foolish than a being unable to discern good and evil?*[120] *For it is clear that he would not flee from the one –*
[196] *I mean evil things – nor would he pursue the other – I mean good things.*

In sum, God prohibited them from tasting prudence,[121] *although nothing could be more honorable for a human than this.*[122] *For it is probably clear even to the unintelligent that the discernment of what is good and what is bad is the proper task of prudence.*[123]

Cyril

Now, an investigation would prove that Julian is ignorant of the force of what was written. But in order to clarify the nature of the whole matter, I suppose it is necessary for me to say a few things to him in response.[124] It is true that complete ignorance of what the good is and also what its opposite is would be appropriate for a beast and more natural to a rock or tree, and is, I think, entirely alien to a rational soul. But the meaning of the phrase "to know good and bad," in the God-breathed scriptures at least, wouldn't in any way indicate that one has received an understanding[125] of things in the form of bare and solitary
[197] knowledge,[126] but in the form of capacity and experience, as will be shown clearly and plainly as my discourse advances.

3.24 Furthermore, I think it useful to say that God created humanity "for good works,"[127] as it is written, lacking no good thing and being complete at least with respect to the principles[128] implanted by nature, I mean those in both soul and body. For his mind had been created in such a way that it could behold God and the things of God, at least, that is, up to the limit assigned to his nature – "For we see in a mirror and in a

[119] The criticism offered here is similar to Porphyry, *Chr.* fr. 47 Becker (= fr. 42 Harnack); for discussion, see Becker, 304–09; Morlet 2011a. See also Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 6.28; for discussion (with comparanda from the Nag Hammadi Corpus), see Cook 2004, 74–77.

[120] See Gen 2:9, 17. [121] Gk.: φρονήσεως.

[122] Julian's phrasing evokes Plato, *Leg.* 1.631c5–6; cf. *Phdr.* 241c5–6 (which is not explicitly in reference to *phronesis*).

[123] *c. Gal.* fr. 16 Mas.; Wright 1923, 324–27.

[124] The "few things" that follow will be marked off as a "digression" at *c. Iul.* 3.28.1–3, where Cyril claims that he will return to his original plan. On Cyril's argument here, see Riedweg 2008a, 201–06.

[125] Gk.: τὴν ἐπιστήμην.

[126] Gk.: ἐν ψιλῇ καὶ μόνῃ … γνώσει. Cf. the "simple and singular understanding" below (*c. Iul.* 3.24.10–11).

[127] Eph 2:10. [128] Gk.: λόγους.

riddle,"[129] as it is written. It was filled with a desire for each and every marvelous thing, and was allotted a knowledge of everything good, though one that was still, so to speak, simple and singular,[130] and it gazed upon it without distraction[131] as though looking at it alone, focused on it with all the inclinations of its will, and readily going towards it as a willing agent. [198]

But[132] as for his body, while it has been made from earth, it was nevertheless superior to death and corruption (even if some unbelievers should laugh when they hear me say this), since this is in fact what God willed and the nature of things follows his decrees and whatever seems good to him he renders entirely and wholly achievable thanks to certain ineffable operations; for the nature of each created thing is exactly what he had in mind. For we could, of course, just use the words Plato has God say to those beings he had created, or rather the heaven and sun and stars which he also calls visible gods:[133] "Therefore, inasmuch as you have come to exist, you are not immortal nor altogether indissoluble. Yet in fact you will not be dissolved nor meet the fate of death, having found in my will a bond still greater and more sovereign than those by which you were bound when you came into existence."[134] But, if we permit Plato to say this, then we cannot refuse to believe Moses' writings if he should say [199] that what was prone to corruption has, by God's will, been placed beyond corruption.[135]

3.25 So then, his body was superior to death, since the Craftsman of all implanted life in it. And since it was beyond corruption, it was on the one hand allotted innate desires, I mean those desires for food and reproduction; but on the other, his mind was amazingly not tyrannized by inclinations for these things.[136] For he used to do what he pleased with freedom since his flesh was not subjugated to the passions arising from corruption. But when he offended God who had framed him,

[129] 1 Cor 13:12.

[130] Gk.: ἁπλῆν ἔτι καὶ μονοειδῆ τὴν ἀγαθοῦ παντὸς λαχὼν ἐπιστήμην. Cf. the "bare and solitary knowledge of things" above (*c. Iul.* 3.23.23–24).

[131] Although Cyril maintains a studied silence in regard to Origen (in this treatise as well as the rest of his corpus), it may not be accidental that a nearly identical phrase to the one used here (εἰς αὐτὸ βλέπων ἀπερισπάστως) occurs nowhere else in ancient literature except at Origen, *Cels.* 7.39.43 (ἵνα ἀπερισπάστως ἡ ψυχὴ βλέπῃ ἃ δεῖ).

[132] This paragraph is loosely quoted by Moses Bar Kepha; cf. Kaufhold GCS 21, 850–51).

[133] On the visible gods in Plato (*Ti.* 41a), see Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.43).

[134] *Ti.* 41b2–6; also quoted by Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 9.19–23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33.5–8). For a similar appeal to Plato, see *c. Iul.* 1.30.11–16.

[135] *c. Iul.* 3.24.13–15, 18–27 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 850.

[136] Cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 14.26.

disregarding the command he had given, and when the eating of what was forbidden became the beginning of his loss of self-control, from that point onwards he has been conquered by fault-inducing pleasures; the "law of sin" entered the body's nature;[137] the passions arising from improper desires sprang up from corruption as from an unholy root; and the love of pleasure[138] has been running wild in us like an untameable beast ever since, rising up in opposition to our impulses for each and every excellent thing.

For example, the inspired Paul, all but groaning over the weaknesses of
[200] his nature, says: "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am fleshly, since I have been sold [as a slave] under sin. For I do not understand what I do."[139] And again: "For I know that the good does not dwell in me, that is, in my flesh. For the intention of doing good is present within me, but not the doing of it. For I do not do the good that I want, but I do that evil which I do not want. But if I do that which I do not want, it is no longer I who am doing it, but the sin dwelling in me."[140] For if someone were to choose to examine carefully the innate movement of the flesh, I mean that movement which goes after the most improper of passions, [he would see that] "the good does not dwell in us"; for that movement forces the human mind towards the inevitability of abandoning deliberation and choosing to do what is not right and it dares to subject the free person to a yoke of slavery like captives of war. The all-wise Paul also reveals that the revolt it presents is unbearable when he says: "For I delight in the law of God according to my inner person, but I see […] another law at war against the law of my mind, taking me
[201] captive to the law of sin that exists in my members."[141]

3.26 Who, then, led human nature to this point of infirmity joined with misery? It was clearly the utterly evil dragon, who beguiled the woman's as yet simple and innocent reasoning and brought an accusation against the ineffable glory. For, although Eve said that the God of the universe had prohibited them from taking food for themselves from the tree "in the middle of the Paradise of delight"[142] and had even threatened death if they ignored his law, the snake tricked her, saying: "You shall not die with death: for God knew that on the day on which you ate of it […] you would be like gods so as to know the knowledge of good and evil."[143]

[137] Cf. Rom 7:23, 25; 8:2. [138] Gk.: τὸ φιλήδονον. [139] Rom 7:14–15. [140] Rom 7:18–20.
[141] Rom 7:22–23. [142] Gen 3:3, mixed with some phrasing from 3:23–24.
[143] Gen 3:4–5, mixed with some of the phrasing from 2:9.

Observe, therefore, how he became the inventor of destructive teachings. For the snake said that the God of the universe did not tell them the truth, but instead had lied and out of envy[144] had prohibited them from eating, since he knew full well that when they had eaten it they would be gods. Hence, he slandered the supreme and ineffable nature itself and implanted in the first humans' souls the destructive teaching of polytheism;[145] and it is for this reason that he was quite reasonably named the "devil."[146] [202]

So, as I said, corruption leapt into human nature through the transgression and the ever-twisting passions arising from it entered as well – this, I suppose, was the "knowledge of good and evil," not in the sense that our forefather Adam or those born in the beginning received into their mind just a simple knowledge of evil, as one might say, but in the sense that they came to possess knowledge of evil through their very own actions and experience.[147] For instance, it has been written, "Adam knew Eve his wife."[148] Someone would certainly not say that the knowledge in this case indicates a simple kind of knowledge or one that consists of mere awareness; rather the sacred scripture called the act of their coming together "knowledge." Hence, it is the habit of the God-breathed scripture to use the word "knowledge" on occasion to indicate awareness regarding any moral action whatsoever that arises from experience itself. [203]

3.27 The only-begotten Word of God, at any rate, when he was transforming human nature back into what it was in the beginning, nullified "the sin in the flesh"[149] by becoming human; and, moreover, having transferred us, as I said, into "newness of life,"[150] he commands that the ancient dignity of our nature be restored and persuades us to return with nobility once more to that admirable beauty. He said, for instance: "It

[144] Note that Julian will below accuse the God of Genesis of envy and jealousy (*c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 3.29]). By making the claim he does here, Cyril preempts Julian's critique by aligning him with the diabolical serpent of the Genesis account.

[145] Gk.: τῆς πολυθεΐας; cf. Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2.28; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 2.21.

[146] The "devil" (διάβολος) literally means "slanderer" in Greek; cf. Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 28.6, with commentary by Riedweg 1994, 11: 446–47. *c. Iul.* 3.26.11–17 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 850–52.

[147] Other Christian intellectuals had already made the distinction between theoretical and experiential knowing with reference to the knowledge of good and evil at Gen 2:9; see Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. Opif.* 20 (PG 44.200c); John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 17.3; Augustine, *Gn. Litt. Imp.* 8.16.35; Didymus, *Gen.* 4:1–2 (SC 233.275); *Ps.* 34:11, p.212.15; Theodoret, *Qu. in Gen.* 26, p.30.18–22; 27, p.31.1–8 Fernández Marcos/Sáenz-Badillos. But, although Didymus (*Zach.* 2.363) likewise highlights the distinction with reference to Gen 4:1, as Cyril does in the remainder of this section, it is only Cyril who uses Gen 4:1 to confirm his interpretation of a distinction of knowledge at Gen 2:9 (as Boulnois notes, SC 582, 222–23 n. 1).

[148] Gen 4:1. [149] Rom 8:3. [150] Rom 6:4.

was told to the ancients, 'You shall not commit adultery,' but I say to you 'You shall not lust.'"[151] Admittedly, this goal is difficult to attain and hard to grasp, at least in my view, and perhaps it is beyond our nature. But the inspired Paul does not allow us to think like this, since he has written: "For what was impossible for the law, in that it was weakened through the flesh, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh
[204] and, on behalf of sin, he condemned the sin in the flesh in order that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit."[152] When the only-begotten, therefore, became human for our sake, "the law of sin"[153] "in the flesh"[154] was nullified and human affairs were, so to speak, reversed, undergoing a return to our original state: in other words, we prevail over death, corruption, fleshly pleasure, and the other desires which, allied with corruption, were ravaging our feeble and helpless intellect.

3.28 Now then, I suppose this was a necessary discussion, but, since our argument has arguably fallen into a digression on such matters, it must return to the course it had in the beginning.[155] The first humans did not live in ignorance of good and evil in Paradise. For as they were rational, they were allotted the knowledge befitting humans, since the Craftsman rendered their knowledge perfectly suited to their every need and to what was natural for them in terms of their substance.[156] And by keeping their thought untyrannized by the pleasures of the flesh and
[205] improper desires, they were persevering in a holy and thrice-blessed life. But when, as I said, corruption rushed in upon them and when the pleasures that drag one down into bad behavior had been roused in their flesh, they did not experience the simple awareness[157] of evil but now infirmity gained a foothold through experience itself.

And if someone should choose to make an investigation into intellectual substances that transcend body and perception, he would be compelled to say that the knowledge of good and likewise its opposite certainly exists in them; but surely not the kind of knowledge involving the passions that arises from being entangled, as it were, in an actual experience, as we readily say occurred in the case of us humans. For among the holy angels, some, still "preserving their authority,"[158] enjoy a life that is renowned, thrice-blessed, and held in complete awe, keeping their own intellect turned towards the good and looking towards it, and

[151] An abbreviation of Matt 5:27–28. [152] Rom 8:3–4. [153] Rom 8:2. [154] Rom 8:3.
[155] Note the playful parallel: just as humanity needed to be restored to its original nature, so now Cyril's argument needs to return to its original plan as noted at *c. Iul.* 3.23.16–18.
[156] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς. [157] Gk.: τῇ γνώσει (translated previously as "knowledge"). [158] Jude 6.

they reject as impure what is not in this condition; for they are not ignorant of evil, but they know it in an untyrannized and free manner.[159] But there are other angels, "who left their own dwelling"[160] and dismissed what is better, and, by choosing instead more shameful actions, although they had knowledge of evil even before their misstep, they came to know it more distinctly through the actual experience of it.

But if it seems good to you, come, let us confirm our intellect more firmly in the truth, the truth, that is, about the theories currently at hand, and let us raise our discourse as far as the realm of things that surpass all intellect. Shall we grant that the divine and hypercosmic nature, which is so venerable and all-holy, does not have knowledge of good and evil? How then does he provide legislation and, on the one [206] hand, prohibit things that are more shameful and reveal the different types of sins, while, on the other, prompting people towards what is better and clarifying the means by which one can live in a noble manner and acquire a truly select glory for doing so? Therefore, the divine and ineffable nature is good and singularly beneficent, or rather it is quite simply the Good itself. But it is not ignorant of what is evil, though it knows it in a nonexperiential way.[161] In fact it is because we have experienced such knowledge that we have fallen into evil in all its forms.

3.29 Now that we have compiled for ourselves ideas relevant to these topics in the preceding section, let us see what comes next. The philosopher Julian brings his own arguments to a sort of climax by saying the following: [207]

Julian

> *… with the result that the snake was instead a benefactor for the human race and certainly not its destroyer.*[162]

[159] Cf. *c. Iul.* 9.11 on angels not being subject to passions. [160] Jude 6.

[161] Gk.: οἶδεν οὐ πρακτικῶς.

[162] This part of the fragment is only a result clause, not a complete sentence. It could naturally be the ending of the last sentence of *c. Gal.* fr. 16.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.23.13), so that together with it the full sentence would read: "For it is probably clear even to the unintelligent that the discernment of what is good and what is bad is the proper task of knowledge, with the result that the snake was instead a benefactor and certainly not a destroyer of the human race." In any case, Cyril seems to have similarly quoted a result clause from a fragment of Porphyry without its preceding principal clause at *c. Iul.* 5.20.31–33 (= Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 278), if, that is, we should take the ὥστε there to be introducing a result clause. Alternatively, Masaracchia *ad loc.*, considered this result clause to correspond to Cyril's immediately preceding οὕτως, thus continuing Cyril's words, so that the fragment of Julian only starts in the next sentence.

And this is not all, for Julian also adds again to what he said:

> *On top of this, God is said to be jealous.*[163] *For when he saw humanity sharing in prudence he "cast them out of Paradise" to prevent them from tasting, God* [208] *says, "from the tree of life," stating explicitly: "Behold, Adam has become like one of us so as to know good and evil, and now perhaps he will stretch out his hand and take from the tree of life and eat and will live forever. And the Lord God sent them out from the Paradise of delight."*[164]
>
> *Therefore, each of the things said – unless it is a myth containing a secret theory, which is what I have believed*[165] *– these words are full of a great deal of* [209] *blasphemy against God.*[166] *For being unaware that the one created to be an "assistant" would be the cause of the transgression, prohibiting the knowledge "of good and evil," which it seems alone sustains human life, and to top it off being struck with jealousy at the idea that humanity might partake of life and thus go from being mortal to being immortal – all of this is characteristic of someone who is consumed by envy and jealousy.*[167]

Cyril

3.30 What I've said above is sufficient as a proof of the stupidity inherent in his words. But it would do no harm – on the contrary, it would be beneficial for readers – if I choose to say a few more things at [210] this point on the same issue.

For in fact, it was not because humanity "*had come to share in prudence*" that the God of the universe drove them out of Paradise – for they were rational and had been created so at the beginning. Nor on the contrary was it an act of "*jealousy and envy*," as Julian has dared to say, to prohibit *"them from eating of the tree of life*," lest "*they live*

[163] On the theme of God's jealousy in Julian's critique, see also *c. Gal.* frs. 29; 30; 33; 36 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.2; 5.6; 5.13; 5.28). Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.37 (drawing on Plato, *Ti.* 29e), 38, 40, 48.

[164] Gen 3:22–23.

[165] Some scholars, along with Socrates Scholasticus (*H.e.* 3.23.36), see this clause as Julian's recognition of allegorical truths behind the surface meaning of the biblical texts ("unless it is a myth containing an ineffable theory, as I believe"); see Bouffartigue 1992, 161 n. 81; Cook 2004, 264–67; Boswell 2022, 256–64. The GCS apparatus, however, interprets the clause to be a denial of the possibility of such biblical allegorical truths ("if it is, as I believe, not a myth containing an ineffable theory"), drawing on a similar passage in Plutarch, *Def.orac.* 46, 435d; cf. Masaracchia 1990, 38; Smith 1995, 206; Riedweg 2005; Boulnois 2008a, 115–16; Niccolai 2023, 155–64. On Julian's view of the Bible and myth, see also *c. Gal.* fr. 23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.29); for his views on myth more generally, see *c. Gal.* fr. 4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.11.1–7) and *c. Iul.* 4.1.21 with notes *ad loc.*

[166] This sentence is also quoted by Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.23.32, although it is attributed to Julian's "third book against the Christians" (3.23.33), possibly because he erroneously confused a reference in his notes to the present passage in Cyril's third book; see Nesselrath 2001, 40 with n. 91.

[167] *c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas.; Wright 1923, 326–29.

forever." Rather, the character of God's foresight in this very matter should actually be admired, at least by those who are of sound mind. For[168] they had once and for all neglected the divine laws, they had been conquered by the pleasures of the stomach, and finally they had been brought down to such a degree of misery that they were even sick with "the law of sin"[169] in the very nature of their body and thus were about to sink into each and every form of reproachable conduct; so it was necessary to prevent them from being preserved in this world as an undying evil and from leading a long life incurring the hatred of the all-holy God in the same manner as unclean spirits. Surely someone would say that it would be better for those who have erred from what is [211]
good not to appear entirely and constantly wicked but to cease, as it were, and reach the limit of their evil, heaping up for themselves a hope of at least some mercy through the imposition of death as a form of punishment.[170]

Hence, in order that humanity might not have a long life on this earth after having taken hold of the knowledge of evil that comes through experience and incurs God's hatred, their life was, with the utmost skill, curtailed by the death of the flesh, since God knew the appropriate moment for showing clemency and loving-kindness to them. And this is what the inspired Paul teaches, having written that the mystery of Christ was "foreknown before the foundation of the world, but was revealed at the last" moments of the age,[171] when it was necessary that there be a correction of what had happened to human nature. [212]

3.31 Therefore, these are in fact hardly mythologies or fictional accounts of pointless nonsense, but rather wise and essential discourses that in no way have erred from the truth. For I suppose even the very experience of things would suffice as proof of the truth that the Craftsman of the universe was executing a supremely well-ordered[172] plan when he subjected human nature to death after seeing it tyrannized by sin, namely in those first humans at the time of Adam. Nevertheless, Porphyry, a partner[173] in his way of thinking, also

[168] This sentence is preserved in the *Cat. in Genes. 1* Petit; for a notice of its textual variants, see Boulnois SC 582, 233 n. 3.
[169] Rom 7:23, 25; 8:2. [170] Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.23.6; Boulnois SC 582, 571–72.
[171] 1 Pet 1:20; Cyril seems to make the misattribution of this verse to Paul regularly, conflating it perhaps with 2 Tim 1:9–10; Rom 16:25–26; Col 1:26 (incidentally, in none of these NT passages is the key word καιρός used, for which cf. Eph 1:10); see *Ep. Fest.* 5.7.35–37; *Is.* 25:1 (PG 70.557a); *Jo.* 17:24 (3.8.14–18 Pusey); all cited by Boulnois, SC 582, 234 n. 1.
[172] Gk.: οἰκονομικώτατα. [173] See *c. Iul.* 3.21.2 for a similar partnering of Porphyry with Julian.

provides additional confirmation. For he said the following in the first book *To Nemertius*:

> God, knowing what is going to happen, frequently acts in advance to remove people from this life, some due to their youthful piety and others due to the future damage they will cause to those closest to them, while still others he pities and removes in advance to avoid irreparable misfortunes.[174]

And indeed, he elsewhere also said the following:

> Chrysippus, the follower of Socrates,[175] did not think it right to say "Who knows [why]?" in response to things that happen but rather, "This was absolutely for the best." For unless it is possible to sketch out an administration better than the divine one, we must surely suppose that what happens is better the way it is. For is it not true in your own experience [Nemertius] that, when you received from the emperor down here the task of exercising providence over a certain portion of the human empire[176] and
> [213] obeyed the laws for the benefit of the political order, it was impossible for you to maintain a lawful political order in any other way than to exile some of your subjects, confiscate the property of others, and even condemn still others to death; and is it not the case that you did not preserve the life of all its citizens since doing so wasn't in the interests of everyone? So then, when it comes to one who administers so great a world as this, are we really not going to let him administer his own realm in the manner he deemed right for the universe, without being called to account by us, even when he proceeds by means of deaths and changes [of fortune] and by the indefiniteness of one's lifespan?[177]

3.32 So indeed, [Julian] accused even his own teachers, who by no means indict the ineffable plans[178] of the God who rules over the universe

[174] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 280 Smith. This otherwise lost work is quoted only in *c. Iul.*; see our note above at *ad Nemert.* fr. 276 (at *c. Iul.* 3.8.3–11).

[175] If this is Chrysippus the Stoic (who lived 279–206 BC), it is somewhat odd to designate him a follower of Socrates who had died over a century earlier. At the same time, Stoics frequently considered themselves to be the true successors of Socrates (see Long 1988, 150–51, 160–64), and the sentiment here would surely be appropriate for one of the great defenders of providential determinism (see Collette 2021, 65–102).

[176] This seems to be a reference to Nemertius' holding of a governorship. The PLRE entry (1.621) only states that he was "probably a senator," following Bidez 1913, 67 n. 2 (which provides a list of all [apparent] senators familiar to Porphyry).

[177] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 282 Smith (cited again at *c. Iul.* 5.22.2–15). Although Cyril does not explicitly state that the quotation comes from the *ad Nemert.*, the attribution to this work seems likely, given the fact that both here and in the case of its later citation in book 5 it is given immediately after quotations that are expressly attributed to that work.

[178] Gk.: οἰκονομίας.

for being out of order, but instead avoid prying into them and honor them with the verdict of being entirely right. For they have assigned to the highest knowledge the task of steering the rudder of human affairs in accordance with its own understanding of what is right and skillful and in whatever way seems preferable to it and it alone. For the one who is the source, giver, and governor[179] "of understanding and wisdom"[180] for everyone else could in no way miss what is best and blameless in either speech or action.

God, therefore, was not envious nor was he overcome by pangs of jealousy like us, but was instead carefully crafting what happened. For [214]
Moses has shown that the first human was carried away by the dragon's tricks into a futile hope, supposing he could perhaps even be a god by eating of the tree, since he has introduced the God of the universe as saying: "Behold, Adam has become like one of us."[181] For in fact it is not the case that he was a god on account of his transgression, but he was caught having fallen into the most extreme misery.[182] Furthermore, the fullness of the holy Trinity would become clear to us also through these verses; for it was not to one of the holy angels that the one beyond all creation said, "Behold Adam has become like one of us"; rather, the one ineffable nature beyond all things, which is in the holy and consubstantial Trinity, addressed these words to itself.[183]

3.33 But Julian once again redirects the method of his "*intrigue*"[184] against us to yet further topics and attempts to compare his own entirely wretched doctrines to those of the Christians,[185] saying the following:

Julian

> *With respect to what both [the Jews] correctly believe about God and our fathers have handed down to us from the beginning, our account is as*

[179] Gk.: πρύτανις.
[180] Cf. Exod 31:3, in reference to Bezalel the master craftsman for constructing the Tent of Meeting and its accoutrements.
[181] Gen 3:22.
[182] For a brief survey of various patristic interpretations of the preceding biblical passage, cf. Boulnois, SC 582, 572–75.
[183] For a similar claim with respect to Gen 1:26, see *c. Iul.* 1.29.3–17; here Cyril seems to have influenced Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 1.5 Albl (PG 46.196c).
[184] Gk.: σκευωρίας; Cyril seems to be turning this term back on Julian, who had earlier used it against the Galileans (*c. Gal.* fr. 1.3 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.2.27]; already echoed at *c. Iul.* 2.5.6); cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 51.4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.1.15).
[185] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

[215] *follows:*[186] *the Craftsman proximate to this world*[187] *– for Moses mentioned nothing at all about beings higher than this; at least, he ventured nothing about the nature of the angels, except he said often and in many passages that they minister*[188] *to God. But he nowhere specifies whether they are generated or ungenerated; whether they are generated by one god and have been assigned to minister to another or they do so in some other way.*

Thus Moses provides a narrative about heaven and earth and the things in it, and how they were ordered.[189] *He says that God commanded some things "to come into being"*[190] *– like day, light, and firmament – but he "created" other things*[191] *– like heaven, earth, sun, and moon – while yet other things, which already existed but were still hidden, he "separated"*[192] *– like water and dry land, I guess. In addition, he dared not speak about the generation or making of the Spirit, but only, "And the Spirit of God was moving over the water."*[193]

[216] *But he fails to make clear whether it was ungenerated or generated.*[194]

Cyril

3.34 Now it is not difficult to see that he uses inventive speech in a disordered manner,[195] and, abandoning the path that was most appropriate to his argument, he has fallen into intervening nonsense. Nevertheless, let us address him on these matters, too.

[186] Julian seems to be returning to his comparison of the biblical and Greek cosmogonies in *c. Gal.* frs. 6–10 Mas., after what Boulnois (SC 582, 240 n. 1) aptly calls a "parenthesis" in frs. 13–16 Mas., which criticized Gen 2–3 (discussed in *c. Iul.* 3.2–32). Our translation smooths over the rather abrupt syntax between this clause and what follows, which may be an anacolouthon intended by Julian (as the GCS apparatus supposes) or the result of a lacuna in Cyril's quotation (as Gollwitzer and Boulnois suppose); see Boulnois, SC 582, 240 n. 2. In any case, Julian's claim here seems to be that the biblical creator cannot be the supreme God since the Craftsman is "proximate to this world" – this, at least, is the thrust of Julian's critique as Cyril sees it in his immediate response at *c. Iul.* 3.34.7–9 below.

[187] Gk.: τὸν προσεχῆ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου δημιουργόν. This is the first occurrence in pagan literature of this title for the Platonic demiurge: "the proximate Craftsman"; see Boulnois, SC 582, 70–74. Julian was anticipated, however, by Origen, *Cels.* 6.60: τὸν μὲν προσεχῶς δημιουργὸν εἶναι; cf. also Clement, *Str.* 6.17.161.6 (where the Son is said to be "proximate" to the first cause). For Julian's own use of the title "proximate Craftsman" (apparently assuming an Iamblichean demiurgic hierarchy, which divided, or rather interwove, the work of creation between a hypercosmic intelligible craftsmanship and an encosmic craftsmanship; cf. Finamore 1988), see also, *c. Gal.* frs. 19.11–12; 25.9–10; 28.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.37.16; 4.38.13; 4.46.4), as well as *c. Iul.* 4.44.14–15.

[188] The language here (λειτουργοῦσι) resonates with the Psalms (cf. 103[104]:4, quoted by Cyril below at *c. Iul.* 3.36.11–13) rather than the Pentateuch.

[189] This portion of Julian's fragment most likely draws upon and responds to Origen, *Cels.* 4.55; see Boulnois 2014.

[190] See Gen 1:3, 6, 14, 15, 20.

[191] See Gen 1:7, 16, 21, 25.

[192] Gk.: διακρῖναι; in fact, *Genesis* uses slightly different verbs of separation or gathering, such as διεχώρισεν (Gen 1:4, 7, 18) or συνήχθη … εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν (Gen 1:9).

[193] Gen 1:2, also cited by Celsus (at Origen, *Cels.* 6.52) and Numenius (at Porphyry, *Antr.* 10).

[194] *c. Gal.* fr. 18 Mas.; Wright 1923, 328–29.

[195] This is true of the syntax of Julian's fragment; furthermore, there seems to be deliberate play with Julian making a disordered (ἀκόσμως) discourse about how the world had "been ordered" (διεκοσμήθη) by Moses' God in lines 13–14 of the just-quoted fragment.

The inspired Moses clearly declared to us that the one highest God who is beyond all is the Craftsman of the universe, but it was through his Son in the Holy Spirit; for thus the ineffable nature is indeed "proximate" to his creatures, understood in the manner of an extrinsic relation. Why, therefore, does Julian come up with such incredibly stupid lies and say that nothing at all is said about what he calls the "highest God"? For what is beyond the one who is beyond all things? What sort of origin can be conceived for the origin of the universe? For his father and teacher, Plato, "*specified*"[196] that the "*Craftsman*" who is the source of all is one[197] – and also says he is "*proximate to the world*"[198] – but that another god, or rather, the form of the Good, subsists prior[199] to this one; and he also has a notion of a third cause, which is lesser than the first two in rank and in nature, and indeed he also calls it the soul of all beings.[200]

But as for us, when it comes to the vision of God, we have been enriched with a wiser and more precise account and have been taught to worship the one true nature of divinity in the holy Trinity, which is beyond every generated thing, attending as we do upon the words of [217]
those who speak about God. We hold, therefore, that God the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit,[201] is the Craftsman of the universe, whose intelligible and hypercosmic beauty one could, in my view, trace out – at least insofar as possible – on the basis of the fact that the things generated were well made. And indeed it is readily conspicuous that it was brought into existence with an order that is fitting: "For since the creation of the world, his invisible attributes, namely his eternal power and divinity, are clearly visible," it says, "apprehended in the things that have been made."[202] Moreover, we claim that the account of Plato himself also agrees with this statement; for he said one will need to ascend from the beauty of perceptible things to the intelligible beauty of God,[203] and one must contemplate his excellence on the basis of "the [beauty] contained in the laws and common practices."[204]

3.35 Now, although we also praise the path of contemplating God[205] in this way – for the creation loudly proclaims its Craftsman – it is not only

[196] Cyril here adopts Julian's term from *c. Gal.* fr. 18.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.12).

[197] Plato is nowhere so explicit; we must wait until the Platonic–Jewish expressions of Philo of Alexandria (e.g., *Opif.* 171.6) and Josephus (*AJ* 1.155), followed by Christians and later Platonists (e.g., Clement, *Str.* 1.19.94.2; 5.14.102.2; Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 56.6 Sodano). Julian, for his part, acknowledged elsewhere that "the Craftsman of the universe is one, but many are the craftsmen-gods who orbit in heaven" (*in reg. Sol.* 16.140a).

[198] *c. Gal.* fr. 18.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.7). [199] Gk: προϋφεστάναι.

[200] Cf. Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 8.27.8–18, partly quoted also at *c. Iul.* 1.47.5–9).

[201] On the role of this formula in Cyril's Trinitarian theology, see Boulnois 1994, 585–89; Crawford 2014, 42–55. Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.35.26–27; 4.38.27; 8.31.35–36; 8.32.15–16.

[202] Rom 1:20. [203] Cf. Plato, *Smp.* 210a–211c. [204] Plato, *Smp.* 210c3–4. [205] Gk.: θεοπτίας.

on the basis of what we have just mentioned that we marvel at the Father; rather, it is on the basis of the exact image of him, namely the Son, that we are even more astonished; for in his own nature he inscribes
[218] his begetter for us in an intelligible fashion.

Furthermore, someone could learn from Plato's own words that, although he established the first God, as he says at one point, in stillness[206] and immobility,[207] he himself recognized in a different sense that he moves in a creative way through the second [God] as it pleases him in turn. For he said,

> These are the lives, not only of the first God, but also of the second. And it is clear that, while the first God will stand firm, the second on the contrary is moving; therefore, while the first concerns the intelligibles, the second concerns the intelligibles and perceptibles.
>
> Do not again be amazed that I said this; for you will hear something much more amazing. For, instead of the movement present to the second God, I claim that the stability present to the first is a kindred movement, from which the ordering of the world, its eternal permanence, and its preservation are poured forth to the universe.[208]

Since, therefore, the "stability" of his "first" God might be understood quite rightly as "kindred" to the "movement present to the second God" – for in this way he co-establishes generated things and he allots order and permanence to each[209] – our accuser has recited a futile declamation against[210] the history of Moses, saying that he revealed "*nothing*" at all about the first and highest God, although he has clearly written that all things were brought into being and subsistence from the Father
[219] through the Son in the Spirit.

3.36 But, Julian claims, he is found to have written "*nothing about the nature of angels*." This was because he had to avoid saying what cannot be understood. For if it is true that, "We discover the things at hand with

[206] Cf. Plato, *Phdr.* 250c2. [207] Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 38a2.

[208] Numenius, fr. 15 des Places (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18.20–21, from which the mistaken attribution to Plato probably arises, since Eusebius had just previously quoted a fragment of Numenius at 11.18.19 that had named Plato, "For this reason, *Plato said* that wisdom came to humans through the work of Prometheus with a sort of most brilliant fire").

[209] In other words, the passage from Numenius, here misattributed to Plato, can be taken to support the notion that the Father's (i.e., the "first" God's) immobility is a sort of "movement" in its presence as a basis for the world's eternal ordering or a fountain of its eternal preservation, which agrees with Moses' presentation of the Father creating all things through the Son. Consequently, as Cyril is fond of pointing out, Julian's own authorities undermine his criticism of Christianity. See Boulnois, SC 582, 81–84.

[210] Gk.: κατερραψώδηκε.

force,"[211] as it has been written, and if the inquiry into things that are perceptible and subject to opinion[212] is something our minds can lay hold of only with great difficulty, how could one speak of matters transcending perception and possessing a glory residing far beyond human language?[213] For how could anyone doubt that they are generated when Moses names them ministers[214] and says they are yoked to someone else's will as though by necessity? For everything that is under a yoke is a slave; and whatever might be said to minister is not entirely free by nature. And the inspired David also at one point sings: "He makes spirits his angels and fiery flames his ministers."[215]

Since a similar topic[216] occurs in Julian's accusations against Moses – for he claims Moses said nothing about the divine Spirit, whether it is generated or ungenerated, but only that "the Spirit of God was moving over the water"[217] – he should listen to our response: "Yet shouldn't one examine the meaning of these words in a more thoughtful and careful manner than he has done? For if Moses gave the Spirit an altogether [220]
divine name,[218] how could it be understood as generated, or how could that which is created naturally belong to the one who is uncreated? Therefore, by merely saying that it is the 'Spirit of God' he has testified that it is also ungenerated. For that which comes from God according to nature could not be of a nature different from his own or foreign to him in terms of substance, at least if we are sticking to an account that is reasonable and in keeping with the appropriate theories."

In addition to this, Julian accuses the supremely excellent Moses for introducing to us the God of the universe as at one time bringing into existence some beings by a word, while at another time having also "created" [others].[219] In response to this, we claim that his account was formed in an excellent and very sensible manner on every point. For it was necessary, yes necessary indeed, to declare not only that God was the

[211] Wis 9:16; it should be noted that the LXX has the final word πόνου, "with hard work" instead of Cyril's βίας ("force").
[212] For this phrase, cf. Plato, *Ti.* 28a2; 28c1 (cited at *c. Gal.* fr. 8.6–7 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.31.26]); 52a7.
[213] Or: "human reason" (λόγου).
[214] Gk.: λειτουργούς; Cyril follows the terminology used by Julian at *c. Gal.* fr. 18.7, 9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.9, 11), although it is difficult to find angels designated "ministers" in a writing attributed to Moses (see instead, Ps 103[104]:4, which is quoted next by Cyril).
[215] Ps 103(104):4.
[216] That is, something having to do with spirits (but now transitioning to the Holy Spirit), just mentioned in the immediately preceding biblical quotation.
[217] Gen 1:2; for a similar appeal to this verse in defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, see Athanasius, *Ep. Serap.* 1.5.1.
[218] That is, he referred to it as "the Spirit of God" in the just mentioned passage from Gen 1:2.
[219] For this distinction, cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 18.11–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.14–15).

generator of the universe, but also to add the most advantageous point that he accomplishes whatever he wants by a word and a nod. For while the ability to create something is also in us, nevertheless it does not happen in an identical manner – far from it! – but rather by labor and by working with our hands we give form to matter and therefore become inventors of arts and are called craftsmen. The activities of God, therefore, will transcend ours by incomparable differences; for he brings what
[221] once did not exist into existence, but nevertheless is seen to be carrying out such deeds by the mere act of willing, as his Word fastens together whatever he decides.

3.37 But perhaps Julian understands none of this: as though he had no shame and had given free rein to his insults against God, he always contrives something else still more impious than his previous remarks and attempts to prove that "*the one proclaimed* in the writings *of Moses*"[220] must be described as and must in fact be "*a certain one*" of the many beings who are thought to be gods "in part,"[221] so much so that he even "*was allotted* as his portion" some "smallest" piece of land under the sun – I mean, Judea – and yoked to himself only the single race of Israel and is perhaps barely able to "exercise providence over" his subjects and then only with difficulty. Then, throwing together certain strange and puerile concepts, he
[222] imagines that he has provided a sufficient proof for his argument.

I am going to set forth each of his nonsensical assertions "part by part,"[222] omitting the majority and gathering together briefly those passages that relate to the same way of thinking. Accordingly, he said,

Julian

> *Since, therefore, Moses has surely not discussed everything about the Craftsman proximate to this world, let us compare with each other the views of the Hebrews and our fathers on these same topics.*

[220] The language in this paragraph anticipates that of Julian (with the italics denoting identical or closely cognate wording), *c. Gal.* fr. 28.3, 8–12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46.5–6, 12–16; cf. 3.42.15, 16–17 for similar anticipations). Furthermore, the phrase "barely able … with difficulty," echoes Julian's own wording elsewhere in his corpus; see especially *ad Ath.* 5.273c; 6.276a; *in reg. Sol.* 19.142c; *Mis.* 41.369c.

[221] Cyril's language here is a pastiche of Julianic terminology; although Julian designates the God of the Hebrews a "partial" deity (μερικόν, *c. Gal.* fr. 28.9 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.46.12]) who was concerned only with "partial things" (μερικά, *c. Gal.* fr. 20.25 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 3.46.30]), his phrase "in part" (ἀνὰ μέρος) here certainly echoes Julian's term, while also allowing him to play with the notion below where he states that he will respond to Julian's argument "part by part" (again, ἀνὰ μέρος, though necessitating a slightly different translation in English).

[222] Gk.: ἀνὰ μέρος, which plays with Julian's claim that the God of the Hebrews was a "partial" god; cf. *c. Iul.* 3.37.4, above.

Moses says the proximate Craftsman of this world "chose" the nation of Hebrews and is devoted[223] *to it alone and cares for it, and Moses assigns to him the administration of this nation alone.*[224] *But as for the other nations, Moses makes no mention whatsoever of how or by which gods they are administered – unless one were to concede the following words, that he "assigned" the "sun and the moon" to them.*[225]

But more on that a little later. For now, I shall show that Moses himself, the prophets after him, and Jesus the Nazarene say that he was the God of Israel alone and of Judea and that these people were "elect";[226] *as does also that man who surpasses all the magicians and deceivers that have ever existed anywhere on earth, Paul.*[227] [223]

Listen to their very words and first to those of Moses: "Tell Pharaoh, '[…] Israel is my firstborn son.' And I have said, 'Let my people go that they might worship me; but you were unwilling to let him go.'"[228] *And a little later: "They said to him, 'The God of the Hebrews has summoned us; we shall go, therefore, on a three-day journey into the wilderness, to sacrifice to the Lord our God […].'"*[229] *And again after a few things he similarly says: "The Lord the God of the Hebrews has sent me to you saying, 'Let my people go in order that they might worship me in the desert.'"*[230] [224]

Cyril

3.38 To these he strings together still other quotations compiled from the sacred scriptures, attempting to confirm that he has been named God of Israel alone and that the race descended from Abraham has been

[223] The verb προσέχειν here ("is devoted") seems to be a play on the adjective "proximate" (προσεχοῦς) which he had just applied to the Craftsman.

[224] For the criticism of the geographical and ethnic restrictiveness of the biblical God, see Origen, *Cels.* 4.36; 5.41; 6.78.

[225] Cf. Deut 4:19. Julian's reference may be an allusion to Origen, *Cels.* 5.10 (see also, Origen, *Jo.* 2.25), or Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.9.15, both of whom Julian seems to have known; see Boulnois 2011b, especially 816, 824; Boulnois 2014. Earlier Christian thinkers had cited Deut 4:19 to demonstrate that God had cared for other nations by providentially allotting them heavenly bodies as a means of drawing their attention up from the created order to what was beyond; see Justin, *Dial.* 55.1; 121.2; Clement, *Str.* 6.14, 110.3; Boulnois, SC 582, 575–76.

[226] Cf. Isa 42:1 (for further biblical references, see Boulnois SC 582, 256 n. 3).

[227] For the accusation that the disciples were charlatans and deceivers, see Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 1.6; 6.14, 40–41; 8.37; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.31.2; 4.14.9; Eusebius (?), *Hierocl.* 2.25–27 DesPlaces/Forrat; cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* frs. 70, 72, and 1T Becker (= frs. 4, 5, 21A Harnack, respectively). For discussion, see Cook 2000, 38, 156–57, 213. Julian will return to this claim at *c. Gal.* frs. 78–80, 82 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.47; 10.1; 10.8; 10.17).

[228] Exod 4:22–23. [229] Exod 5:3.

[230] *c. Gal.* fr. 19 Mas.; Wright 1923, 338–43. The final biblical quotation is from Exod 7:16.

allotted to him as his particular inheritance.[231] Then he brings his own arguments to a climax, asserting that, as for the God of the Hebrews, it is important that we think of him, not as the generator of the whole world nor as the ruler of the universe, but, as I said, as diminished and thought to have limited authority amidst the welter of other gods. This, then, is the aim[232] of Julian's innate perversity.

Now for our part we shall also make counterarguments on each point, pitting the truth against his cunning devices, such that those who admire his claims might know that he has quoted the words of the God-breathed scripture in a crude way[233] to give the appearance of being some wise man well-studied in the doctrines of the Christians.[234] But we shall see from the facts themselves that he understands nothing at all, but is self-
[225] absorbed,[235] arrogant, and tells unbridled lies.

He has cheated the God of the universe, by maintaining first – I know not how – that he entirely neglected the other nations, and secondly that he cut off for himself Judea alone and foisted the yoke of his kingdom upon only those descended from Israel. On this basis, in my view, someone could quite easily delineate the frailty of Julian's innate way of thinking; for he is entirely ignorant of the fact that the highest nature has the entire creation under its feet and exercises providence over the universe.

To begin with, we claim that knowledge of the divine[236] has been implanted into human nature, and that the Craftsman has instilled within it an innate awareness of all that is beneficial and necessary for salvation. And because humanity had been allotted such a constitution and proceeded directly to the truth on the basis of the world's generation, orderliness, beauty, and continuation in this state, they naturally saw how great is the "wisdom and power"[237] beyond every mind, which belongs to the one who framed it and brought it into existence.

And what's more, the most excellent Moses has taught well on this subject, rekindling the law inherent in nature. For he has compiled for us
[226] discourses about God and he says that he is generator of all the world without anything at all being excluded. For he says, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,"[238] in my view, indicating in brief

[231] For a lucid contextualization of Cyril's argument in what follows (up to *c. Iul.* 3.52) within his broader theological and exegetical thinking about Israel's elect status in relation to the nations, see Boulnois 2008b.

[232] Gk.: ὁ σκοπός. [233] Literally, "with no experience of beauty" (ἀπειροκάλως).

[234] Cf. *c. Iul.* Dedic.4–5. [235] Or, "is narcissistic" (περιαυτίζεται). Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.1.19; 9.39.2; 10.27.19.

[236] Gk.: θεογνωσίαν. [237] Job 12:13.

[238] Gen 1:1. Eusebius likewise quotes this and the first verse of the next-cited passage (Gen 2:4) for similar effect (namely, that everything that exists was created by God) at *P.e.* 11.29.1.

and summary fashion also all the things contained within them both. And again: "This is the book of the generation of heaven and earth […] on the day that God made the heaven and the earth, […] and all the grass of the field."[239] So then, if Julian is going to use the words of Moses to fight against us, he ought to believe Moses.

3.39 So how could he who constructed this universe by a nod and brought it into existence by a word, possessing a power that is so supernatural and incomprehensible to every mind, he who made "a human upon the earth,"[240] how could he have consented to ruling over just a handful of people despite the fact that he has a claim to stretching across the universe and not being thought of amidst the welter of other gods, with a circumscribed realm of authority?

Come, then, let us investigate[241] the reasons why God might have decided to do otherwise, or rather let Julian himself come and teach us. Was he weak and unable to exercise providence over the universe?[242] If so, how then does he appear to be capable of its making and generation? For it would be quite unpersuasive and insolent, in my view, to say that, while he possessed a competence and power sufficient for the task of creating, he was nevertheless still unable to rule over it as well. And yet, isn't it easy to see that he exercises his rule in a properly divine manner? For, indeed, just as much as it was in the beginning, so even to this day the creation shows an inclination towards movement and there is nothing [227] that has thrown it into complete confusion and disorder. For the sun moves in an orderly fashion[243] and follows its orbit from the East to the West; similarly, the moon rules the night, and likewise the brilliant chorus of stars is governed by laws. Thus, there arises the sequence of seasons one after the other, the revolutions of night and day marked off by proportional intervals, the growth of fruit, the falling of ripe ones, the births of land animals, birds, and fish; and I will add to these also the affairs of us humans ourselves. The one, therefore, who has placed upon his creatures the ineluctable yoke of his own will, seems to me to rule the universe with supreme strength and has neither cast it aside to others nor established the falsely named gods, who are in fact impure daemons, as harsh masters over his own creatures.[244]

[239] Gen 2:4, 5. [240] Gen 6:6.

[241] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[242] The theme of providence will figure prominently in fragments of Julian discussed in the subsequent book. See *c. Gal.* frs. 21; 24; 25 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2; 4.33; 4.38).

[243] Or, "in the world [ἐν κόσμῳ]."

[244] Cyril will pursue the argument of this paragraph at greater length in *c. Iul.* 4.3–23.

3.40 The most wise Moses has, therefore, introduced God for us as generator of the universe. Observe, please observe, whether the facts themselves don't agree with his words. For he claimed that the "beginning of the day" is under the command of the sun, and in the same way that the moon has been established "as the authority of the night" and is in truth "for times" and "signs," and that the chorus of stars is for "giving light" to those "on the earth."[245] But the one who has written these things
[228] does not intend to impose upon people the obligation of ascribing reverence instead to other gods nor indeed to created things, but he has ordained that they devote themselves solely to the Craftsman of the universe. For he says: "And you shall not, looking to the sky and beholding the sun, moon and stars and all the order of the sky, be driven into error and worship those things […], which the Lord your God assigned to all the nations that are under the sky."[246]

In light of this, how can he say that the God of the universe disregarded the remaining multitude of nations, but ruled only those from Israel and assigned his special providence to them? And yet, the author of our sacred books claims that the benefits of his craftsmanship have been allotted "to all the nations that are under the sky." So in fact Julian ought not belittle so great a good, which is worthy of acceptance, by saying "*unless one were to concede the following words, that he assigned the sun and the moon to them*." For the one we ourselves worship, whom those descended from Israel also accepted on the basis of Moses' writings, is in fact the God of the universe and is revealed to have allotted an ample amount of attention to people everywhere on earth, and this without any interruption; we will now demonstrate this point on the basis of the
[229] God-breathed scripture itself.

3.41 Taking the reins of our discourse and guiding it back to the beginning, so to speak, we shall proceed to the first human himself, namely Adam. Well then, he "was formed" by God and from him the entire race sprang forth, I mean the human race.[247] For this very reason, the human on earth, or quite simply the whole race, is understood as belonging to the God who is over all; for the Lord of the root would naturally possess those shoots that come from the root as his own too.

[245] The language here draws from Gen 1:16; Ps 135(136):9; and Gen 1:14, 15, 17, respectively.

[246] Deut 4:19, already alluded to by Julian at *c. Gal.* fr. 19.18–19 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.37.25). It may be significant that this passage was also cited at Origen, *Cels.* 5.6, 10.

[247] The initial phrase marks an allusion to Gen 2:7 (καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν) and the phrase "sprang forth" (ἀνέφυ) seems to be a pun on "breathed" (ἐνεφύσησεν) in the biblical verse.

Two young men were born from the first man: Cain and Abel. These were the first to have sacrificed, the one rightly, the other not so.[248] For what reason? While he praised right-minded and "just"[249] Abel, the other one's sacrifice he did not accept, and quite rightly so.[250] For it was entirely necessary that their descendants learn from those who were the first to show reverence and piety towards God the proper and blameless way to bring to God the honors that were fitting and owed to him. And this act which ensured that those who had chosen to gain distinction could live a magnificent life would, in my view at least, be indicative of someone who was exercising providence and showing concern. For I, at least, hold that piety towards God is something important and truly worth acquiring. [230]

And in fact, after this pair of brothers, other practitioners of justice were born who are admired for their virtue and whose swift pursuit of each and every good thing has won them the best verdict of all. One of these I hold was the thrice-blessed Enoch, about whom the sacred scripture says, "he was not found"; for "God transferred him."[251] Thus, he transferred Enoch, since everything that is exceptional, admirable, and resplendent with virtuous achievements is dear to God and proper to him.

But when the entire earth "corrupted […] its path," as it has been written, and when the heart of "humanity" had veered away "towards wickedness from their youth,"[252] God let loose a flood upon those throughout all the earth, as though he were recovering an overgrown and barren garden and safeguarding a noble tree in it, namely the most excellent Noah, in order that starting from him the human race might be transformed, as it were, into a new beginning and thus be once more preserved upon the earth.[253]

3.42 But how will Julian respond to this, that man who never in any way relents in his delight at slandering us and who is so clever in his use of words and deception? For if in fact the God of the Hebrews was [231] restricted to Judea alone and possesses a circumscribed dominion, how, tell me, did he let loose "the floodwaters of the sky"[254] upon the inhabitants of the earth and condemn everyone with a single punishment by again engulfing the whole earth entirely with water? If he wasn't ruling

[248] Cf. *c. Iul.* 10.29 (responding to *c. Gal.* fr. 84 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 10.26]). [249] Cf. Heb 11:4.
[250] See Gen 4:4–7. [251] Gen 5:24. [252] Gen 8:21.
[253] The preceding paragraph also appears as a fragment in the catena tradition and was included in Pusey's edition of Cyril's *Commentary on Hebrews*, as is also the case at *c. Iul.* 8.7; 9.17; 10.25. See *Heb.* 11:7 (411.25–412.6 Pusey).
[254] Gen 7:11; 8:2.

all, as Julian claims, why have the other gods been silent? For it was indeed incumbent upon them to defend their respective worshippers and for each one to contend nobly for his own kingdom; but they unfathomably either abandoned their respective worshippers or were lax in their duty of watching over the realm assigned to them.

Therefore, aren't these ideas immediately shown to be ridiculous nonsense fit for old women? What's more, isn't it a clear proof that "the one proclaimed" to the world "by Moses" must not be called a "partial"[255] god or thought of as one of the falsely named gods? For Moses declared him to be the maker of the world and the Lord of the universe, but says the race of Abraham was chosen by God and taken like a sort of first-
[232] fruits[256] of the other nations, since God guides all peoples to knowledge of the divine[257] by means of those he initially invited who are like a root.[258]

3.43 But this noble man, omitting the first part of Moses' writings, actually attempts to limit God's kingdom based on the mere fact that he "chose" Israel. Yet someone could say to him on this point: "Your Excellency, the one who ensnared Abraham in later times and honored his race by an unrivalled verdict, declaring it to be his particular allotment since the other nations had not yet been called, it was this very one and no other who 'made firm the sky' and 'founded the earth upon its stability,' as it has been written, and who, to sum up, produced 'the entire creation,' 'the visible and invisible.'"[259]

Now if Julian is stuck in the swamps of unbelief and considers the all-wise Moses' discourse about God to be unacceptable, this does no harm at all to the power of the truth. For, as the all-wise Paul writes: "Their
[233] unbelief will not abolish God's faithfulness."[260] But since he dares to subject the kingdom of the only true God to boundaries and limits, adducing quotations of the saints and presenting the words of even the all-wise Moses, in which God is seen to call Israel his particular "*allotment*,"[261] come and let us oppose him with other statements of the saints, which reveal him to be the God of the universe. Accordingly, the blessed

[255] As earlier, Cyril is here anticipating Julian's language, e.g., μερικόν τινα at *c. Gal.* fr. 28.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46.12); cf. τοῖς μεριστοῖς at *c. Gal.* fr. 21.11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.14).

[256] Literally, a "first lock of hair" (πρωτοκόμιον).

[257] Gk.: θεογνωσίαν.

[258] Later, Cyril will use the same root metaphor, claiming that Abraham was the "root" of those who were educated by the Law and the prophets; *c. Iul.* 3.52.3. Cf. Rom 11:16–18.

[259] This is a pastiche of allusions to Isa 48:13, Ps 103(104):5, and Col 1:15–16, respectively.

[260] Rom 3:3.

[261] Cyril's use of this term seems to anticipate Julian's language in *c. Gal.* fr. 20.2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46.5).

prophet Isaiah said: "Thus says the Lord who made the sky, this is the God who displayed the earth and made it, he himself set its boundaries; he did not make it to be empty, but to be inhabited; I am he, and there is none besides me."[262] And indeed elsewhere also: "I am your God who made firm the sky and created the earth, whose hands created all the host of heaven, and I did not show you these things so that you would follow after them."[263]

And at one point he has also addressed Cyrus who took the kingdom of the Babylonians by storm: "I called you by my name, and will receive you; but you did not know me. Since I am the Lord God and there is no god besides me and you did not know me, in order that those from the rising of the [sun] and those from its setting might know that there is none besides me; I am the Lord God and there is no other; I am the one who furnished light and made darkness."[264] [234]

3.44 Now, in my view at least, these quotations should suffice on their own. But if Julian thinks he has need of still others, I shall bring forth the following as well: for again it has been written, "Lift up your eyes to the sky and behold: who has displayed all these things? The one who brings forth his world by number will call them all by name from his great glory and in his powerful strength."[265] "I, God, am first and for the things that are coming, I am. Nations saw and the ends of the earth were afraid."[266]

In light of this who could dare to say with impunity that God cut off for himself some small and restricted realm despite the fact that he brought into existence the entire creation and is the generator and Lord of the universe? And in fact, if one chose to recall the plagues inflicted upon Egypt as well, he would no doubt marvel at his omnipotence and the boundless superiority that abides in him; for the whole of creation, yielding as it were to the will of its ruler, was arming itself against those who had offended God. [235]

Furthermore, given that Israel has been named God's "firstborn," what prevented such a learned man from being able to understand that no one, I think, would be considered a firstborn if there were no others before whom he will of course receive priority? Therefore, if Israel is God's firstborn, he no doubt has other brothers too under God as Father. For even if some come later than Israel who was the first to be called, nevertheless they are not excluded from being counted among the children of God, insofar as he is understood to be the Father of all, by virtue of the fact that he himself likewise provided to all of them the

[262] Isa 45:18. [263] Hos 13:4. [264] Isa 45:4–6. [265] Isa 40:26. [266] Isa 41:4–5.

cause of their existence, or rather he himself is the beginning and origin of all things.

3.45 For the fact that all those on earth must be catalogued among the children of God as being collectively his creations is something that we shall recognize on the basis of the following considerations as well. The leader of the synagogue of the Jews – Caiaphas was his name – said that Christ's birth in their midst would benefit the people of Israel. The evangelist adds the following words by way of explanation: "He did not say this on his own, but, since he was high priest that year, he prophesied that Christ would die for the nation, and not only for the nation but in order also to bring together as one the children of God who were scat-
[236] tered abroad."[267] For the whole race on earth has been divided into two nations: the Jews and, of course, the nations.

Therefore, Christ was going to endure the death of his flesh not only for the people of Israel but in order to bring together as one also the other children of God who had been scattered into polytheistic error by the devil's perversity; he did so, that is, in order that, by having brought them together to a single and unerring knowledge of God, "he might create one new human out of the two people, thus making peace," according the scriptures, "and might reconcile them both in one body […] to the Father."[268]

3.46 But that man who insatiably revels in nonsensical statements against God goes on to say the following:

Julian

Not only Moses and Jesus, but even Paul has clearly said that from the beginning God was concerned for the Jews alone and that they became his special
[237] *allotment. And yet, one should be astonished at this claim in Paul's case; for he changes his teachings about God to conform to the circumstances, just as the octopus changes its colors to match the rocks,*[269] *at one time contending that the Jews alone are God's inheritance,*[270] *but, then again, when he is trying to persuade the Greeks to side with him, he says: "Isn't he the God of the nations too, not just of the Jews? Yes, he is also the God of the nations."*[271]

It is, therefore, right to ask Paul: If he was not only the God of the Jews but of the nations too, why would he send to the Jews the prophetic spirit in abundance along with Moses, the anointing, the prophets, the law, the miracles,
[238] *and the incredible myths – for you hear them crying out, "A human ate the*

[267] John 11:51–52. [268] Eph 2:15–16, 18.
[269] For the charge of hypocrisy against an apostle, see *c. Gal.* fr. 78 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.47).
[270] Paul nowhere uses this precise language; but see Rom 9:4. [271] Rom 3:29.

> *bread of angels"*[272] *– and finally he also sent Jesus to them,*[273] *but for us there was no prophet, no anointing, no teacher or no herald to announce that his love for humanity would, although late, one day come to us as well; rather, for tens of thousands of years – or if you like, for thousands of years – he overlooked those who, as you say, were "serving idols" in such great ignorance, those from the rising sun to its setting and from the northern regions to the south,*[274] [239]
> *except for a small race that settled in a single part of Palestine not even two thousand years ago?*[275] *For if he is the God of all of us and likewise the single Craftsman of all, why did he overlook us?*

And after other things, he says,

> *Are we still to pay attention to you because you or someone from your stock formed an image of the God of the universe, though going no further than a bare notion of him? Aren't all these partial [conceptions of divinity]: "a jealous God" – for why is he jealous? – and a God "who punishes the children for the sins of the fathers?"*[276]

Cyril

3.47 Of course it is true that, as Julian says, God was concerned with those from the blood of Israel – isn't this clear to everyone? For it was necessary, yes necessary, that, by being yoked to the divine law and returning from the error of polytheism, they should not be deprived of God's care, and should be taught instead the reasonable means by which [240]
one could successfully return to a better condition and gradually progress towards the capability of learning the mystery of Christ.

But when he says Paul was a "*sorcerer*"[277] and that he attained the pinnacle of all evil, he is denouncing his own fathers and does not exonerate them from this charge, though I'll not bother discussing this since everyone knows it is true.[278] But since he claimed that Paul changes his

[272] Ps 77(78):25; the reference is to manna (Ps 77[78]:24).
[273] Julian's question to Paul up to this point is also preserved in Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* fr. 1.13–18 Guida.
[274] For the criticism of the belatedness of the incarnation, see Origen, *Cels.* 4.7; Porphyry, *Chr.* frs. 76 Becker (= fr. 81 Harnack = Augustine, *Ep.* 102.8), 79 Becker (= fr. 82 Harnack = Jerome, *Ep.* 133.9). See also, *c. Iul.* fr. 41, which responds to the criticism.
[275] For a similar criticism, cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 19.14–16 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.37.20–22) with note.
[276] *c. Gal.* fr. 20 Mas.; Wright 1923, 342–45. The final citation is Exod 20:5; Julian will continue to emphasize this passage at *c. Gal.* frs. 29.10, 30.4, and 32.5–6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.2.10, 5.6.5, and 5.12.24–25). Origen had previously discussed it at *Cels*. 8.40. The theme of God's jealousy will receive lengthy consideration at *c. Iul.* 5.6–23.
[277] *c. Gal.* fr. 19.23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.37.30).
[278] In fact, Cyril has elsewhere raised the counteraccusation against Julian that his charges of Christian sorcery fall against his own side; see e.g., *c. Iul.* 3.21.16–21.

mystical teachings[279] "*to conform to the circumstances*" because he stated – and quite rightly, I might add – "Or isn't he the God of the nations, not just of the Jews? Yes, he is the God of the nations too, if, that is, God is one,"[280] I would be delighted to ask him on what basis he could find fault with such words as though they were not well said.

For the God of the universe will not be deprived of the honors naturally befitting him just because some people have shaken off his yoke and ignored the transcendence of his inherent glory. For if some people despise the common laws that have been established, does this mean that we should also remove from their office those who have the glorious task of legislating, whoever they may be? Or, if someone under the authority of the emperors decided to go beyond what is reasonable, does this mean that the one who sits upon the imperial throne, crowned quite rightly with the highest honors, should slip off that throne? Or if perhaps some of those among us should not know the blaze of the sun's brightness because their eyes have dimmed, would anyone say that, because of
[241] them, the element [of fire] does not emit light, or will he rather pity them because of their handicap?[281]

3.48 If, therefore, he had decided to act reasonably, why does Julian dare to call so venerable and admirable a man a sorcerer and a hypocrite when [Paul] fought with great wisdom against Jewish hot-air and the ignorance of certain individuals? For, since out of their excessively great stupidity certain people, holding the same ideas as the one who wrote against us, supposed that the God of the universe rules only over the land of the Jews, for this very reason the mystagogue [Paul] quite wisely nips this idea in the bud and, equipping himself with the weapons of truth, attacks those thinking these things, and states: "Or isn't he the God of the nations, not just of the Jews? Yes, he is the God of the nations too, if, that is, God is one."[282] For if there is one God over all and if there is no other besides him, he must be the master of all, since he is also the Craftsman of all.

For Paul has confirmed that he is "God of the nations too" through the innate laws that the Craftsman etched "on the hearts" of all: "For when
[242] the nations," he claims, "which do not have the law, do the requirements of the law by nature, they are a law for themselves, despite not having the

[279] Gk.: τὰς μυσταγωγίας.
[280] Rom 3:29–30; notice that Cyril includes the first clause of verse 30, which was omitted in Julian's quotation of the passage in the previously quoted fragment.
[281] Cf. Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 1.2; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.39.3; Gregory of Nyssa, *Or. Catech.* 7.
[282] Rom 3:29–30.

law; they exhibit the work of the law written on their hearts."[283] But if in fact he were God and Craftsman just of the Jews and not also of the nations, how could those who do not have the law be a law for themselves, coming to this as they do by innate instructions? For, [their] nature is enriched in a self-taught manner with the awareness of every good thing, having obtained this, too, by the decrees of their maker.[284] So then, in fact, he of course deems not only those from the blood of Israel to be worthy of his providence, but, as I said, also those throughout all the earth. For there is one master of the universe.

3.49 Since Julian attempts to show in a most unsophisticated and irrational manner that he is God and master only of Abraham's offspring, based on the fact that the nations obtained none of those things that the former were deemed to deserve – for if, he says, God actually did take account of the nations, he naturally ought also to have sent them a prophetic spirit, to commission prophets as mystagogues, and to make the sacred laws, I mean those through the all-wise Moses, shine forth before the other nations, and divine signs likewise should have been displayed to them – we respond as follows, restraining his tongue's intemperance: "Your Excellency, it should, in my view, be both clear and acknowledged that it is especially perilous and absurd to fight against the verdicts of [243]
God." Moreover, someone will opportunely recall the words of Isaiah and will surely say: "Who measured the water with his hand and the sky with the span of his fingers and all the earth by the handful? Who weighed the mountains with a scale and the valleys with a balance? Who knew the mind of the Lord or who became his counselor?"[285] For the divine is all-sufficient and stands in need of absolutely nothing; but rather it instills both "wisdom and understanding"[286] in those worthy of grasping them.

Next, in addition to this, is it not right to take the following into consideration? When it comes to those who customarily train young horses and are skilled in this area, if there is some large number of horses that have been brought to them for this purpose, do they bring them under the yoke altogether in a herd or one by one individually?[287] I suppose it is of course obvious to everyone that they instill in them the habit of running well not as a herd but rather one by one. If indeed the horses that came last were to go on to find fault with the fact that they are not the first to learn because

[283] Rom 2:14–15. [284] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.23.3 (introducing *c. Gal.* fr. 7 Mas.) with note.
[285] Isa 40:12–13. [286] Exod 31:3.
[287] The analogy of moral pedagogy with horse-training was also made by Socrates in Xenophon, *Smp.* 2.10, where Socrates says that the horse-tamer will focus on the wildest horse first before turning to others.

others have entered training before them, despite the fact that the one claiming to teach them is not unaware of the time appropriate for each horse, who would [not][288] acquit the trainer of this indictment – or rather, not an indictment, but a stale accusation and slander? For the teacher was
[244] not in any way lax, but the nature of the matter, in fact, made it necessary that the first horses be the first to be subjected to his expertise. If, therefore, the horse-tamer showed no concern for those horses that came after the first ones, then it would be just to find fault with him, for he was entirely careless. But if, on the contrary, he has kept for the appropriate time the entry of each horse and [given] what was necessary to those called in first, he ought to be released from indictment.

3.50 Unmooring ourselves from so paltry an image and sailing on to greater and much more excellent matters, come, indeed come, let us investigate the ineffable plan[289] of the all-wise God. For Israel, which was the first to be called in, was granted the means by which it would have been reasonable for them, once they were freed from their ancient sickness, to ensconce[290] themselves in better things and be illuminated by divine fear, and to appear enviable and admirable because they were filled with the virtuousness of the law. The remaining multitude of nations was also deemed worthy of care and providence at the fitting moment. For they were called after the others and have their special allotment and they stand in a better position than those who came first. For, while the former were "under law" and punishment, the latter are "under grace"
[245] and forgiveness.[291] And while the former had a servant as a mediator, the latter had as their mediator the very one who is the Son by nature. And while among the former there was a "spirit of slavery," among us there is a spirit who frees us and makes us sons, namely the Holy Spirit; for through him "we cry, 'Abba, Father.'"[292]

Now if he asks why Israel has entered before all the other nations, there is no one, I think, who would not respond with irritation and say: "Dear sir, forget these things and, if having a reputation for wisdom is something you think deserves careful attention and thought, then 'know thyself.'"[293] For the pure Intellect knows, indeed it knows the fitting moment for each occurrence. Shall we then, on the one hand, leave it to

[288] We follow the emendation suggested by Burguière (typescript, as reported in the GCS apparatus).
[289] Gk.: οἰκονομίαν. [290] Greek: ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν. [291] Cf. Rom 6:14.
[292] Rom 8:15/Gal 4:6. This paragraph is redolent of Pauline language in Galatians and Romans.
[293] The saying was placed as an inscription at the entrance to the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi and had received significant attention among philosophers (including Porphyry's four-book treatise, now lost, *On the Inscription "Know Thyself"*; see *De gnōthi seauton*, frs. 272–75 Smith). Cyril again refers to the famous dictum at *c. Iul.* 6.24.19.

the expertise of doctors to determine the best method and to choose the appropriate time for assisting the sick and applying to them a beneficial treatment, while, on the other hand, censuring the entirely excellent and supreme Intellect and recklessly saying that this or that occurrence was done poorly by it? Yet, is it not better to suppose that, when it comes to being wise, the degree to which we say we fall behind and are inferior to him is as great as the gulf and barrier between us, at least according to the rational principles[294] inherent in our natures?

3.51 So when it comes to the mediation of the all-wise Moses, that is all we have to say. But as for the fact that God the Savior of the universe has shown care for the nations and not just Israel alone, this is something we will now easily demonstrate. For one can clearly see him assigning to [246] the nations a providence that was older than the calling of those led by Moses out of Egypt "into the land of promise."[295] For in fact those who have subtly and meticulously numbered the times from the beginning of the age and plowed through so many detailed accounts[296] reckon the number of just about 2,242 years from Adam to Noah, who was tenth from Adam.[297] But in the sacred scriptures, at least, we shall find no one at all born in that period of time who was guilty of the charge of polytheistic error. For although they were blamed for other deeds and there were good reasons for them to be destroyed in the impending flood – since it says, "All flesh corrupted its path"[298] – nevertheless, we won't find anyone at all faulted for idolatry.

After the flood, the human race expanded from the three sons of Noah into an innumerable multitude as though from a new beginning. And after 942 years passed and those from the blood of Noah were scattered [247] in every direction and resided in the regions towards the East and the South, and after they had already gathered together in cities, the first man to rule the land of Assyria was the pretentious and supercilious Arbelus, who is also said to have been the first among humans to receive the title of "god" from his subjects.[299] The Assyrians and their neighboring nations, at least, have continued to sacrifice and worship him.[300]

[294] Gk.: λόγους. [295] Heb 11:9.

[296] Similar wording (διὰ … ἰσχνομυθίας ἐλάσαντες) is applied in a different context at *c. Iul.* 8.30.2.

[297] Cyril no doubt draws here upon Eusebius, who gave this figure several times: *Chron.* I, pp.38.34, 42.32, 45.20–21, 53.29–30, 59.26, 64.14–15 Karst; II, pp.15.4–5, 70a.15–16, 174.5, 250.23 Helm. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.6.1–2.

[298] Gen 6:12.

[299] On this record of Arbelus, see Eusebius, *Chron.* I, p.26.21–22 Karst. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.19.19–23 and 9.12.11–12, where Cyril says the same thing positively about Moses and Enosh, that they too were called "god."

[300] *c. Iul.* 3.51.6–28 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 852–54.

Next, Ninus was son of Arbelus;[301] and the son of Ninus was Ninuas, after whom Nineveh is named, which Semiramis his wife is said to have fortified with invincible walls.

The inspired Abraham, then, was born when Ninus was ruling the land of the Assyrians. Now he detested the undertaking of the Assyrians and was downcast because God's glory was being wronged. Accordingly, Abraham was snatched from the midst of those who were deceived and was called to the light of true knowledge of God.

3.52 How then could Julian, who is clever in arguments, be ignorant
[248] that God cared about the salvation of the nations? For behold, yes behold, Abraham was born as a "root"[302] of those educated in piety by the law and prophets; and we hold that he was called out of polytheistic error into a precise knowledge of the one who is truly God. We claim, therefore, that the almighty God's care and indeed providence for the nations is manifestly older than even the calling out of Egypt of the children of Israel, such that consequently "the acceptance"[303] of the Hebrews by God was also a calling of the nations, which was accomplished in Abraham as a sort of "firstfruits"[304] of the race; for God snatched him as if from a wild tree, so to speak, and made him an authentic worshipper. He said some such thing, at any rate, through one of the holy prophets: "I found Israel like a grape-cluster in the desert and like an early and auspicious fruit[305] in a fig tree I saw their fathers."[306] For while a cluster of grapes in the desert is something difficult to find and hard to procure, once it has been found, it would, I believe, be thrice-desired and worth snatching by all who behold it; and also, when it comes to figs, the sweetest ones are those that ripen first before the others – or rather "early" – and are already at that time more suitable for eating than the others. "It was in this way that I beheld Israel," he says, "and in this way that I found their fathers"; for those throughout all the land of the Assyrians were idolaters and superstitious.

But, as I said previously, the inspired Abraham was being snatched "like a grape-cluster in the desert" and like "an early and auspicious fruit

[301] It may be significant that ms V, rather than giving Arbelus here, opts for Belus, which is the more frequent rendering of the name of Ninus' father in other sources; for Arbelus, see also the Armenian version of Eusebius' *Chronicon* (p.26 Karst). For fuller discussion of this issue (as well as of Ninuas and Semiramis), see Boulnois, SC 582, 294–97 n. 2.

[302] See *c. Iul.* 3.42.21, with Rom 11:16–18. [303] Rom 11:15. [304] Rom 11:16.

[305] Greek: σκοπόν. Although the term could refer to a "watchman" (as NETS takes it), it is clear from Cyril's interpretation of it below that he understands the term in the sense of "goal," referring to a fruit that indicates a future harvest; see Boulnois, SC 582, 299, with 298 n. 1; Boulnois, 2008b, 274–76.

[306] Hos 9:10.

in a fig tree." Indeed, he rightly likens Abraham to those figs that come in early; for among ripe fruit, that which is early is given this name on the grounds that there is also other fruit that will come after it. Therefore, since other nations too would shortly follow in his steps and inasmuch as [249] they were on the cusp of becoming ripe, the faithful Abraham was "early," a "firstfruits" of the calling of the nations.

3.53 Who, then, was it who brought him to this point? Clearly it was Christ. For "the Word was God"[307] and was coeternal with the Father, even if he has become like us at the end of the age. Why, then, does Julian bring an accusation, saying that the Father didn't send him as Savior and redeemer to the nations but instead bestowed favor upon Israel's descendants?[308] In that case he ought to listen to the holy prophets who spoke with a loud voice on this topic, in order that he might clearly learn that Christ was in fact the hope for the nations.

Accordingly, the all-wise Isaiah declared about him: "And there will be […], on that day there will be one Lord and his name will be one, encompassing the whole earth."[309] And [Christ] himself says at one point in one of the prophets: "'Be glad and rejoice, daughter of Zion, since behold I myself am coming and I shall dwell in your midst,' says the Lord. And many nations will find refuge in the Lord on that day and will be a people for him and they will dwell in your midst. And know this, that the sovereign Lord has sent me to you."[310] And again: "Since the [250] sovereign Lord says this: 'Once more I will shake the sky and the land, the sea and the dry ground; and I will shake all the nations together, and

[307] John 1:1.

[308] We diverge slightly from the punctuation for this sentence in the GCS edition (followed by Boulnois), which takes it as Cyril's report of a question by Julian ("He levels an accusation saying, 'Why … '"). The phrase ἀνθ' ὅτου occurs in combination with αἰτιᾶται six times in *c. Iul.*, and in the other five places it is clearly a question and marked as such in the GCS edition: 2.25.23–24; 6.32.20; 6.33.16–17; 6.36.14–15; 7.40.10–11. In three of those other occurrences (2.25.23–24; 6.32.20; 6.36.14–15), αἰτιᾶται precedes ἀνθ' ὅτου, as it does here.

[309] Zech 14:9–10a. Cyril's citation of this passage deserves some comment. First, he has misidentified it here as coming from Isaiah although later he will correctly attribute it to Zechariah (*c. Iul.* 8.13.20–21). Second, he or a copyist seems unintentionally to have omitted the rest of the clause that was introduced by the first "will be" (which we have marked with an ellipsis), thus making an odd repetition of that verb. Third, the LXX puts a full stop between verses 9 and 10, starting a new sentence with the masculine participle κυκλῶν ("circling"), which grammatically cannot be dependent upon the neuter noun τὸ ὄνομα ("the name") that precedes it. Both here and in the later citation in book 8, however, Cyril's version has the neuter participle κυκλοῦν, which he reads as dependent upon τὸ ὄνομα, such that the "name" is "circling." It may be significant that the participle is similarly rendered when this verse is quoted by Didymus (?), *Trin.* 2.18 (PG 39.736a).

[310] Zech 2:10–11; partly cited later at *c. Iul.* 8.43.1–5 (and also Eusebius, *D.e.* 2.2.10; Theodoret, *Affect.* 10.86).

the chosen of all the nations will come, and I will fill this house with glory,' says the sovereign Lord."[311] Now it would not be difficult to pile up still other passages on top of those we have cited; but when the actual events that have transpired suffice as an incontestable confirmation of our argument – for the multitude of nations has been called and sanctified by Christ, resplendent in its faith in him – there is probably now no reason to consider substantiating these things by still more biblical verses.

3.54 Furthermore, if the sacred scripture happens to say that God is "jealous" and indeed that he also "repays the sins of the fathers upon the children up to the third and fourth generation to those who hate him," no one ought to be scandalized by this.[312] For in fact the divine and ineffable nature is not like us but is so sublime and moves so high above us in an intelligible sense that even the principles that distinguish it from us are incomparable. For the dispositions related to each event are understood in our case as involving the passions,[313] since our nature is sick [251] with impotence and an extreme propensity to discord. But when it comes to the God over all, while such states are indicated with human language and words, they nevertheless are not understood in this manner – why? – because the divine is passionless. And he is said to be "jealous" because he wants to ensure that no one who has once recognized his glory should be shaken by inclinations[314] towards what is baser. For it is wrong, or rather it is entirely unholy, to trivialize the service of God and to ascribe reverence to profane and unclean daemons.

Therefore, if he is said to be "jealous" he would be acting in these cases in the manner we have just described, given that he is good by nature and "wants all people to be saved and come to a knowledge of truth."[315] It is characteristic of the one who is truly good to care whether there is anyone anywhere who, having slipped from the truth and pushing the divine light out of their mind, might foolishly slip into choosing to adopt inferior thoughts and to fill their own mind with darkness and folly. For those who remain firmly committed to their duty of appearing single-minded and wise will certainly receive rewards from God, but those who [252] incline towards what is not permitted will receive retribution, punishment, and the resulting harm. Thus, he "is jealous," if we must also speak

[311] Hag 2:6–7, cited in Heb 12:26.
[312] Exod 20:5 (= Deut 5:9); cited in a more abbreviated fashion at *c. Gal.* fr. 20.25–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46.31–32).
[313] On divine and human dispositions (διαθέσεις), cf. *c. Iul.* 5.6.27; 5.14.3; 5.26.2; 5.26.9.
[314] Gk.: ῥοπαῖς. [315] 1 Tim 2:4.

in human terms, in the sense that it pains him to see some of those who have become his subjects miserably ruined.

3.55 Those who have once been accepted must surely learn this lesson too, in order that they might know that their indifference does not go unpunished. For wouldn't it be fitting for good fathers also to have this sort of mindset about their legitimate sons? Then how can this be disputed?

"He repays the sins of the fathers upon the children, up to the third and fourth generation," not without further qualification,[316] for the essential phrase "to those who hate him" has been added.[317] For this reason indeed someone could, in my view, even stand in great amazement at the incomparable clemency of the master of all. For if, in fact, any humans should become indifferent and sin-loving, thereby also provoking the legislator's hatred of evil against their very own selves, God, showing tolerance to the first generation and not letting loose right on the spot the punishment for their sins, grants this kindness also to the second generation; and sometimes his tolerance proceeds even "to the third […] generation." But as for those descendants of the third generation, if they should still choose not to be outdone by their ancestors' errors but should perhaps become worse and crueler than them, looking towards indifference with even less restraint and inhibition, at that time, yes at that time, he quite reasonably punishes them but only rarely and with hesitation. For he is by nature good and is the principle and origin of all clemency. [253]

And we are also reminded of this point by the statement of Ezekiel who also taught this very thing and did so with great clarity. For he declared: "The soul which sins is the one that will die; and the son will not inherit the wrong of his father nor will the father inherit the wrong of his son […] Each person will die in his sin that he committed."[318] This is the holy verdict of the God who judges justly, and he does not make war against his own laws.[319]

We must, therefore, understand in a pious manner the statement that "he repays the sins of the fathers upon the children, up to the third and

[316] Here Cyril corrects the impression Julian had given (at *c. Gal.* fr. 20.25–27 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 3.46.31–32]) by ending his quotation of the verse here, without the further qualification provided by the remainder of the verse.

[317] Exod 20:5 (= Deut 5:9). Cf. Origen's discussion of this passage along with Ezek 18:20, which Cyril is about to quote, at *Cels*. 8.41.

[318] The first segment of biblical quotation is from Ezek 18:20, while the second, though it echoes the content of Ezek 18:24b, is in its precise wording taken from Jer 38:30.

[319] *c. Iul.* 3.55.4–26 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 854.

fourth generation to those who hate him"[320] – this means he will do so only if neither the first, nor indeed the second, nor the third, nor even the subsequent generations do not cease from their accursed and sin-loving mindset. For they would be the ones who are also "hating God" because they dare to oppose his divine ordinances; and a just punishment would understandably come upon those who have been condemned for such deeds.

[320] Exod 20:5 (= Deut 5:9); cited by Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 20.25–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46.31–32).

Book 4

4.1 Julian has, therefore, denounced God's glory and cried out most [254]
disgracefully against the doctrines of Moses, as though it was otherwise impossible for him to secure a winning verdict for the Greeks' superstitions unless he vilified the teachings of Christians[1] – a tactic in keeping with his deceptions and love of slander.[2] And yet, surely it would have been necessary and better, at least in my view, if he supported their opinions with the facts themselves – assuming there is something true in them – and didn't deck them out in the inventive bombast[3] of certain persons,[4] just like those women, for example, who are courtesans and suppose they can dispel the shame of their activity with seductive chitchat and superficial make-up.[5]

But, with regard to Julian and each and every person who wants to think like him, we, too, should say in the Savior's words: "Whenever he [255]
speaks a lie, he speaks in keeping with his own nature, since he is a liar, just like his father as well, and he does not stand in the truth."[6] Therefore, it is difficult, or rather impossible, for the truth to spring forth from Greek mouths and a mind full of the devil's activity.

Furthermore, this noble man is self-absorbed[7] and acts with bold presumption towards his own ancestors. For, indeed, he does not accept

[1] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.
[2] Cf. Julian's framing of his treatise as an imaginary courtroom scene at *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.7) and Cyril's initial response at *c. Iul.* 2.7–10.
[3] Gk.: ταῖς … εὑρεσικομπίαις, a hapax legomenon.
[4] Cyril probably alludes to Julian's reverence for Plato. Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.13.22–24; 2.31.18; 2.32.7–8; 2.34.17–22; 2.43.4–5; 2.45.20–21.
[5] The comparison of Julian's attempt at seducing readers of his polemical work to the seductive tactics of prostitutes recurs at *c. Iul.* 6.2.2–4 and 7.9.1–4. Cyril used the same metaphor to describe the heretics Arius and Eunomius at *Thes.* prol. (PG 75.12bc).
[6] John 8:44. [7] Or, "is narcissistic" (περιαυτίζεταί). Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.38.15; 9.39.2; 10.27.19.

the words of the poets, calling them "myth-makers";[8] and he boasts and is pretentious, anchoring himself in the words of Plato alone, although he was born later than the others[9] and he faced noble opposition from his contemporaries; for one of them was his very own student Aristotle, who was supercilious and exceedingly arrogant, and possessed the greatest cleverness in doctrinal and rational precision, and others after him have won no small amount of glory for carrying forward his way of thinking. I shall omit saying here how and in what way the opinions of them both are irreconcilable with each other, since the argument that we already made on this topic is sufficient.[10]

4.2 I now proceed to another topic. As I said, Julian follows Plato's views but also, I think, adds his own, too, when he declares that "*the*
[256] *proximate Craftsman of the world*" (to use his own words)[11] is the master of the universe, and, although he subordinates everything to his rule, in another respect he in turn removes him from ruling over us and is not embarrassed to allot his kingdom to countless other gods besides him. For he writes once more as follows:

Julian

But, observe again our views in comparison to those ones. For our [writers]
[257] *claim that while the Craftsman is the common father*[12] *and emperor of all, he has allotted the rest to ethnarchs*[13] *ruling over the nations and city-guarding*

[8] The word μυθοποιός ("myth-maker") is not used in any of the surviving fragments of *c. Gal.*, though Cyril similarly uses it again at *c. Iul.* 4.32.12 as Julian's way of referring to Homer. It is possible Julian did indeed use the word in some lost portion of *c. Gal.* Certainly, he elsewhere discusses Greek myths; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.11.1–7), a passage that Cyril probably quoted out of sequence and may well belong with the material he cites in this book. What Cyril obscures here is that Julian would only not accept the words of the poets *in their literal sense*; he was certainly open to allegorical interpretation of the poets, and possibly even the Bible (see *c. Gal.* fr. 17.10–12 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 3.29.16–17, with note]).

[9] This recalls the chronological argument at *c. Iul.* 1.4–19, and specifically the mention of Plato at *c. Iul.* 1.15.21–22.

[10] See *c. Iul.* 2.16.23–17.20; 2.45.1–6.

[11] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 18.4–5; 19.11–12; 25.9–10; 28.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.6–7; 3.37.16; 4.38.13; 4.46.5).

[12] The notion that the Creator was the "father" of all goes back to Plato's *Timaeus* (see, e.g., 28c3–4) but had become something of a commonplace by Cyril's time (see, e.g., Plotinus 1.6.8.21; Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 40 Sodano; Proclus, *Theol. Plat.* 5.15ff; and the apparatus of the GCS edition for a fuller, though not exhaustive, list of instances).

[13] Gk.: ἐθνάρχαις, literally one who has "rule" (ἀρχή) over a "nation" (ἔθνος). While many thinkers had believed that nations had guardian gods (or daemons or angels), Julian may be the first to apply the specific term ἐθνάρχης to a divine rank. He may be responding to Christians who believed that angels (either good or fallen ones) had been assigned by God to the nations based on Deut 32:8 ("he set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God") and sometimes also on Ps 95(96):5 ("the gods of the nations are daemons," according to the LXX); see

gods,[14] *each of whom governs his own allotment in a way corresponding to himself. For, since, on the one hand, in the Father everything is perfect and* [258]
"everything is one,"[15] *but on the other hand, among the particular gods a different power predominates in each, therefore Ares governs the warlike nations, Athena the nations that are warlike as well as prudent, and Hermes those that are more intelligent than daring; and likewise the nations governed by them correspond to the individual substance*[16] *of their respective gods.*

If, therefore, experience does not testify to these words of ours, let our doctrines be a fabrication and a poorly timed rhetorical ploy and let your doctrines be praised. But if the complete opposite is the case, and experience has forever been testifying to what we are saying while nothing at all seems to conform with your words, then why do you maintain such a love of controversy? For tell me, what is the cause of the Celts and Germans [259]
being bold, the Greeks and Romans being generally civic-minded and humane while at the same time being both steadfast and warlike, the Egyptians being quite intelligent and skillful, the Syrians being unwarlike and prone to luxury, yet intelligent and rash, adaptable and quick to learn?[17] [260]

For if one were to determine that there is no cause of this difference among the nations, but instead say that they have even turned out the way they have spontaneously, how can he suppose that the world is still administered by

especially Origen, *Cels.* 1.24; 3.35; 5.26–32, 46; 7.68, 70; Eusebius, *P.e.* 5.2.1; 7.16; *D.e.* 4.6.9–10, with discussion in Johnson 2006a, 166–68. The Middle Platonist Celsus had set forth a similar view, albeit in a less developed form than Julian (see Origen, *Cels*. 5.25; 8.35). For a closer pagan precedent (no doubt ultimately derived from Plato, *Plt.* 271d3–e7; *Crit.* 109b1–c4), see Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 17.6–9 Sodano ("a certain protector and certain individual [daemons]," preside over the "human herd, some over nations, some over cities, and some oversee people on an individual basis"); or Iamblichus, *Myst.* 5.24–25, especially 5.25, 236.5–6 and 237.2–3 ("since a certain common overseer has been assigned over each nation on the earth" by God, one should make appropriate sacrifices to all those who are "in the universe, the gods, angels, and daemons distinguished in accordance with the nations"); Iamblichus, *Myst.* 7.4–5. For general discussion, see Boulnois 2011b, 808–27; Riedweg 1999, 88–91.

[14] Gk.: πολιούχοις θεοῖς. When writing to the Alexandrians, Julian referred to Serapis as their "city-guarding god" (*Ep.* 111 [p.188.15–16 Bidez] [= *Ep.* 47 (pp.144–45 Wright)]). See also *ad Ath.* 8.280d; *Mis*. 28.357c; 33.360d; 39.366b.

[15] This claim, originating with the Presocratics Heraclitus and Xenophanes, had been aired in a number of different contexts by the time of Julian; the list in the GCS apparatus (which we have rendered more precise) contains the following: Heraclitus, fr. B 50 Diels-Kranz (= D46/R86 Laks/Most); Xenophanes, fr. 21A 31.3 and 21A 34 (= R4 and R23 Laks/Most); Plotinus, 3.1.4.20; 3.6.6.23; 6.5.1.26; 6.5.7.8; 6.6.17.42; Porphyry, *Sent.* 38; *Corp.Herm*. 12.8.6; 13.17.18; 13.18.1; *Asclep.* 2.23–24. It is, however, unclear whether Julian was here drawing on any precise predecessor (Bouffartigue's discussion of Heraclitus in Julian's corpus intentionally omits this passage, since its relation to the Presocratic is uncertain; see Bouffartigue 1992, 263–65).

[16] Gk.: οὐσίαν.

[17] The ethnic stereotypes in this passage were commonplace in Greek and Roman literature well before Julian penned these lines, and they occur elsewhere in his own corpus; in *c. Gal.*, see also, fr. 24.10–18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33.9–17).

providence?[18] *But if one does posit that there are causes for these differences, then, in the name of the Craftsman himself, he ought to speak up and teach me [what they are]!*[19]

Cyril

4.3 This is the right moment for us again to state what was said by the voice of Ezekiel the prophet: "Alas for those who prophesy from their heart and see nothing at all."[20] For "who has known the mind of the Lord," as it has been written, "or who has been his counselor?"[21] For that noble man is lying and, all but declaring that he has intimate knowledge of the divine ideas, he claims that the nations have been allotted to
[261] certain "*ethnarchs*" and "*city-guarding*" daemons, or as he says "*gods*."

Well then, for us who wish to learn, Julian ought to explain whether God was yielding the exercise of providence to others because in certain instances he proved to be incapable of ruling over them and had insufficient power to do so or because he was entirely capable of it and possessed the power to rule without even having to exert any effort. If, then, he claims the Craftsman of the world was too weak and indicts him for renouncing his rule, he lays a sentence of impotence upon the substance that surpasses all things. But if, on the contrary, Julian knows that the Craftsman has the power to rule but then claims that he has chosen not to do so, he ought to teach us the reason he did so.

For if he says the herds of nations have been allotted to "*city-guarding gods*," since they know how to educate the nations better than the Craftsman, then the instructor of such utterly disgraceful doctrines must ultimately concede, even if he is unwilling to do so, that the "*proximate Craftsman of the world*," despite being the Creator of all, had made, I know not how, certain [gods] who are superior and exceedingly more skilled than himself. But if, on the contrary, they were worse [at educating the nations] and did not do so in accordance with God's own

[18] Origen similarly argued that it would undermine the notion of divine providence if the parts of the earth were under the oversight of various heavenly beings due to chance or randomness (*Cels.* 5.26). While non-Christian philosophers had formulated various positions in favor of a notion of providence (beginning with Plato, *Leg.* 10, as well as the statement at *Ti.* 30b6–c1), Julian offers a somewhat rare account of providence as a source for ethnic differences (rather than merely for the proper running of the universe or as pertaining to individual humans and animals); see Riedweg 1999, 79–84. For general discussion of ancient providential theories (without special discussion of Julian), see Dragona-Monachou 1994. On the competing anthropologies and accounts of ethnic difference presented by Julian and Cyril, see Bouffartigue 2005; Crawford 2024.

[19] *c. Gal.* fr. 21 Mas.; Wright 1923, 344–47. [20] Ezek 13:3. [21] Isa 40:13 = Rom 11:34.

nature and knowledge, it would not be characteristic of a good Creator to prevent his creatures from sharing in what is better.[22]

"But," Julian says, "he did not deem it right to do this." And yet how does this assertion not make God guilty of contempt?[23] Why did he even wish at the outset to create these beings when he disdains their education and considers the duty of ruling over them to be something trivial and to [262] fall beneath the honor befitting him? I, on the contrary, maintain that the ardent desire to be conformed to the all-holy God "insofar as possible,"[24] through whatever illustrious brave deeds and pious virtue someone might be capable of valiantly undertaking, is both something greatly to be sought and truly worth desiring.

4.4 Accordingly, [it must be that] he entrusted the guidance of the nations to other "*gods*," even though he loves virtue. Did he, then, do so in order that they might teach this thing [namely, likeness to God and virtue], or rather, as he himself says, so that they might, in whatever way it pleased them, convince the nations to conform in their thinking and acting to whatever each of those assigned [to rule] over them might choose, and even more so that they might compel those yoked under them to follow their rulers' judgments?

If, then, he claims that the nations have been given to them in order that [their subjects] might be guided also towards what pleases God, then doesn't this imply that all peoples on the earth should be seen as "*cultivated*,"[25] good, experts in all virtue, and dependent upon one and the same judgment? For the will of God is surely not a variable thing nor indeed divided into one thing and another, but rather it is uniform with respect to the good and whatever is admirable.

But, if this is not the case, and he contends that the nations were given to the "*city-guarding gods*" in order that, as he says, "*each governs his own allotment in a way corresponding to himself*," come then, yes come indeed, and let us see if Julian is not audaciously denouncing God's providence [263] by thinking and saying such things.[26]

For while "*the Celts and*," in addition, "*the Germans are bold*" and bloodthirsty, "*the Greeks and Romans are generally civic-minded and*

[22] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.37, drawing on Plato, *Ti.* 29e1–2.
[23] On divine contempt for humanity, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.37.5; 2.42.23.
[24] Cf. Plato, *Tht.* 176b; *Ti.* 29e; Julian himself will appeal to the notion of assimilation to the divine at *c. Gal.* fr. 36 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.28.9–10 with note).
[25] Cyril's use of this term anticipates *c. Gal.* fr. 24.15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33.14).
[26] Here, Cyril picks up on exactly what Julian identified in the last fragment (*c. Gal.* fr. 21 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.2]) as his motivating concern – upholding divine providence.

humane […]*, and the Syrians are prone to luxury*."[27] I myself would add those nations dwelling towards the East too: for while the Scythians are both savage and murderous, they say that the Chaldeans practice incest with their mothers and are mad for their sisters and do the most shameful things of all, while no one punishes them and, in fact, their laws even encourage them to do these things.[28] And, to add something further from the Mosaic writings: the inhabitants of Sodom, because they were violently titillated by the good looks of males and wildly pursued pleasures contrary to nature,[29] they utterly perished in fire as loathsome and profane. Furthermore, the Romans rightly[30] condemn such shameful deeds and are practitioners of justice, lovers of knowledge, enemies of unholiness,[31] and the fiercest adversaries to everything inappropriate.

4.5 If, therefore, each of the "*city-guarding gods*," in whatever way pleases them, implants such an idea and mindset in those who happen to
[264] be yoked to them – for instance, implanting in the Persians and Medes the mindset they possess, in the Germans and Celts their savagery and harshness, while in the Scythians their unavoidable thirst for blood and savage delight in murders, and in the Romans their unavoidable tendency towards honoring exceptional deeds – someone might say, "What is this, noble sir, and besides, what kind of 'providence' would produce this result? How could we still be just in indicting the nations, even if one were to see them caught in the most extreme vices? Or how could one rightly praise those who are practitioners of the best habits, if neither they nor indeed others were permitted to do voluntarily what pleased them, but in fact they were practicing vice and virtue as a result of being tightly bound by necessity to the dispositions and laws of the '*city-guarding gods*'?"[32] For those who choose to do good of their own volition quite reasonably receive appropriate praise, while those who are lovers of unholiness and have come to this point in their thinking by free inclinations[33] must be corrected and called to account by the laws.

If, therefore, as I said, those nations under discussion have developed either a good or a bad character without having any say in whether their
[265] thinking and actions conformed to what was better or more shameful, we will have to retract our praises of those who are good and our

[27] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 21.20–24 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.23–28).
[28] Julian himself will raise the topic of Persian incest below at *c. Gal.* fr. 24 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33).
[29] Cf. Rom 1:26–27. [30] Gk.: ὁσίως. [31] Gk.: ἀνοσιότητος.
[32] Cyril makes a similar critique of the notion that human lives are governed by fate, chance, and genesis at *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.449ab).
[33] Gk.: ῥοπαῖς ἐθελουσίοις.

denunciations of those who are not good for not being so. The admonishment of children by their fathers would likely now be a pointless and entirely useless endeavor; again, guidance of the young by those who know how to introduce the finest subjects would probably be superfluous and empty recitation. In addition, we shall destroy even the laws themselves, which have been the arbiters of what should or should not be done. For, unless each person has a say in pursuing whichever way of life he should decide to take, instead of being led by the decisions of others and being tied to this course with a chain that is difficult – nay, rather, entirely impossible – to escape, then, as I said, one must eradicate laws and everything else that is beneficial.

4.6 I would be most delighted to ask our opponent the following question. There are a great many herds of nations that are beyond number throughout all the earth that lies under the sun: some are beastly in character, train themselves in savagery, and consider the life full of every reproachable activity to be glorious; others maintain a way of life[34] that is full of everything good and make much of living in the most excellent and noble way possible. Nevertheless, the all-wise Julian insists that all [266]
are allotted to "*city-guarding*" and presiding "*gods*" and daemons, and indeed also angels and a particular class of souls.[35] Well, then, does he praise the ways of the Greeks[36] and delight in the laws of Romans, or will he decree that the customs and character of the former nations are the most beautiful of all? Will he marvel at the barbarians' boldness and harshness or will he do what is just and admit that those who have inclined towards civility are in a superior condition to the others?

But, I suppose indeed that he censures the character of the former nations and, in contrast, admires the character of the latter ones. Then how could it be the case that "*the Craftsman of all*" and "*father*"[37] gave to some nations overseers that were "*wild*,"[38] uncivilized,[39] and did not know how to carry them towards anything praiseworthy, but gave to other nations civilized and sensible overseers? In that case, won't someone, albeit unwillingly, be declaring and crying out, on the basis of the facts themselves, that the Intellect beyond all has failed to formulate a good

[34] Gk.: πολιτείαν.

[35] The "particular class of souls" would seem to be a term for the class of "particular" or "individual" souls that have descended into the physical world from the World Soul within the Neoplatonic schema; cf. Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 24.145c. With this sentence Cyril has in mind Julian's claim at *c. Gal.* fr. 26.2–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.40.4–6).

[36] Gk.: τὰ Ἑλλήνων. [37] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 21.7–8 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.10).

[38] Possibly anticipating *c. Gal.* fr. 22.4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.24.6).

[39] The term used here (ἀτιθάσους) is not Julian's but Cyril's, already adopted above at *c. Iul.* 4.6.4.

plan? For anyone who wants to do so can see that the barbarian race is easily provoked towards unbridled impulses, and they are so eager for bloodshed that they consider nothing to be better. Indeed, therefore,
[267] governing all these [nations] in a manner that seems best to him is that "one born to be an evil," Ares, "the rager," that "bloodthirsty" "blight to mortals"[40] – for thus has he been named by those poets who know him.

Then how could God, the lover of virtue, have left so many herds of nations under the "one born to be an evil" and the "blight to mortals"? For if his goal[41] was to adorn human nature with all virtue, why was he not giving these nations to noble tutors, so to speak, who were capable of teaching these things? But, if, on the contrary, he takes no account of our affairs but simply casts them aside to instructors in evil, and instead places them under gods, daemons, and angels who are skilled at compelling them towards everything inappropriate, why does he indict them as lawbreakers and why is he inclined to censure them for not living rightly?

4.7 For, I suppose, if someone were to ponder these ideas he might say: "To which teachers do sensible fathers bring their own children? Is it not to the best and most serious? To which slaves do we usually entrust the guidance of other slaves? Is it not to noble and doubtless also reasonable ones who reliably guide others towards what pleases their masters? And,
[268] tell me, to which helmsmen is it appropriate to entrust the guidance of a trading ship? Is it not to the most skilled and to those who know quite well how to navigate wisely at sea? To which farmers should the care of the garden belong: to those who are careless and have utterly no idea how to do that which is most beneficial and advantageous, or to those skilled in this area? Shall we then consider God's conduct to be inferior to ours and shall we place his actions beneath those of humans?"

Is this not, then, madness and aren't these ideas full of insanity? [The Craftsman] would clearly be caught benefiting human affairs in no way by these actions, but would instead be adding to their harm, and not permitting them at all to attain the virtuous life, if it is the case that each of those gods or daemons established [over the nations] forces them unwillingly to follow his will. For [Julian] says, "*Ares governs the warlike nations, Athena the nations that are warlike as well as prudent, Hermes those who are more intelligent than daring, and likewise the nations governed by them correspond to the individual substance of their respective gods*."[42]

[40] For the first two epithets, see Homer, *Il.* 5.831; for the second two, see Homer, *Il.* 5.31/455.
[41] Gk.: σκοπός. [42] *c. Gal.* fr. 21.12–15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.15–18).

But, dear sir, in that case for those who were going to fare well, as God wanted them to, it would have been better that they not follow the nature[43] and mindset of those "*who govern*" them but rather that they submit to the Craftsman of the universe. And I shall tell you how this is so, for Julian himself said: "*For, since, on the one hand, in the Father everything is perfect and 'everything is one,' but on the other hand, among the particular gods a different power predominates in each, therefore Ares governs* [269] *the warlike nations, Athena and Hermes* the others."[44] Therefore, given that "*in the Father everything is perfect and one*" while "*among the particular gods*" there is only ever knowledge of a single given thing, then wouldn't it be better and more profitable for the nations to conduct their affairs under God and be taught by him alone, in whom all good things exist perfectly, or would it instead be better that they be under others who are not entirely good and are suitable for one thing alone, naturally just like those who pursue the arts of manual labor, I mean someone like a blacksmith or a potter?

And yet this would show that they are not even gods. For, indeed, the one who is by nature the true God is understood to be something all-powerful and perfect in itself, self-sufficient for any and every particular task, the fountain and origin of every good. So how could that which does not exist in such a state but bears only a single invention of its weak mind, and even then only with difficulty – how could something like this be thought of as God?

4.8 Furthermore, anyone who wants to can recognize, even on the basis of human affairs, the ugliness of the view held by the Greeks.[45] For those who sit conspicuously upon the thrones of the earthly empire and [270] have received power over all things appoint as protectors for the country districts and crown with the insignia of office whichever of their subjects they know to be wise and expert in the finest matters. And those who are deemed worthy of such splendid rewards govern their jurisdiction by directing it not in accord with their own laws but those of the inspired men; they doubtless pass on the praises they receive from everyone to their highest superiors and assign what is owed to the emperor's prerogative – tribute, taxes, levies. They erect images of the emperors in private

[43] In *c. Gal.* fr. 21 Mas., cited above, Julian does not use the word φύσις ("nature") with reference to the gods appointed over the nations; here Cyril seems to be anticipating *c. Gal.* frs. 22 and 26 Mas., quoted below, where Julian introduces φύσις into his discussion of this topic.

[44] *c. Gal.* fr. 21.10–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.13–17).

[45] In what follows Cyril considers the analogy between the activity of the daemons in relation to the Craftsman and the political dynamics of the earthly empire. Julian himself will highlight this analogy at *c. Gal.* fr. 28 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46).

and in public, thereby ever making their subjects remember their sovereign's preeminence, no doubt just by the mere sight of them.[46]

Come, therefore, let us see if those "*city-guarding gods*" and daemons, as well as angels, having received their rule from God as Julian claims, have preserved for him the honors he is owed – the worship, the reverence, the presentation of gifts, the glory – instead of placing them upon their own heads. And yet, is it not clear that this is exactly what they have done? For they entirely carried the inhabitants of the earth away from any knowledge whatsoever of the one who is by nature the true Craftsman and master of the universe; moreover, they snatched for themselves the honors given by all – the sacrifices, feasts, hymns, and thank-
[271] offerings – and they have persuaded the inhabitants of the earth to be dedicated to their service alone. And what even are the statues placed in the sacred precincts, one might ask, if they are not multiform and diverse images, presenting a profane insult against the glory of God? For the artisans of these things attempt to drag down the formless nature under the guise and form of not only human bodies but also those of irrational animals, fish, and birds.

Now, if the "*city-guarding gods*" and daemons were doing these things with the assent of the Father of all, it ought, of course, to be clear that he considers our knowing him to be worthless and that he disowns our worship. And if this is the case, how could we think of ourselves as pious when we worship him and serve him through the life he approves? And indeed, why do we treat contemplating him as the most important thing of all and why do we say that those who see him, even if but "in a mirror and a riddle,"[47] are blessed?

4.9 But if, on the contrary, it was in violation of God's will that the inhabitants of the earth wandered in error, and if it was the [daemons] who dragged them to this condition against their will, then what sort of argument could release [the daemons] from the charge of tyranny against
[272] God? Or how many tears would need to be shed for those who have fallen into this state? For at one time, they were counted among the holy angels and had been reckoned with the choirs of the spirits above, living the truly blessed and undefiled life. But, as the sacred text says, "they have not preserved their own authority,"[48] and, all but bidding farewell to

[46] Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.15.9–20, where Cyril makes a similar argument regarding the location of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden. In 425, probably around the time *c. Iul.* was being composed, the emperor Theodosius issued an edict that distinguished the veneration to be offered to images of the emperor from worship of the divine (*CTh.* 15.4.1).

[47] 1 Cor 13:12. [48] Jude 6.

being with God, they slipped into what is more shameful and, abandoning the station assigned to them and thrusting aside their duty of submitting to God, those wretches were excluded from the throng of the saints as stubborn and haughty. They divvied up the inhabitants of the earth among themselves and they herded them away from everything virtuous and kept from them all knowledge, at least with respect to the identity of the one who is by nature the true God of the universe, the Lord to whom power over all things is essentially anchored. They have persuaded them to "worship the creation rather than" him[49] and, contriving for each of the nations a form of reverence that seemed good to them in their simple and unreflective state, they caused [them] to establish [it] in shrines and to construct altars and honor them with libations and sacrifices. [273]

Since it was likely that the inhabitants of the earth would be guided by innate impulses towards their duty of knowing the truth and beholding, with the subtle eye of the mind, the identity of the God and Father of the universe and thus would depart from the perversity of the [daemons'] rule, and would unlearn what is worse and choose instead what is beneficial,[50] for this very reason, the daemons became for them guides and teachers in everything wicked and they have not ceased dragging them down to each and every thing that is hateful to God. For it seemed to them to be a good idea to kindle enmity so that those on the earth would remain disconnected from God, with sin ever impeding them.

4.10 But when the Lord and Craftsman of the universe, the Word of God, saw humanity driven away from all good behavior and falling in droves into abysses under the earth – for "Hades widened its soul and opened its mouth without ceasing,"[51] as it has been written – and when he "appeared to us,"[52] we were rescued from their greed. And, indeed, [274] those holy and rational powers, who had received their origin from him and subordinated their thought to his rule in a completely blameless way, habitually serving their master's will and in their own case preserving their obedience entirely above reproach, these ones [the Word] urged to join in the fight on behalf of the oppressed, not because he suffered from any impotence when it came to the task of saving them – for how could he and what would be the source of such impotence? Rather, he is like an emperor permitting native-born guardsmen to resist barbarian attacks and to scare off from his subjects their greedy advances.

[49] Rom 1:25.
[50] Cyril presumably has in mind the natural theology he has already discussed at *c. Iul.* 2.22–23.
[51] Isa 5:14. [52] Ps 117(118):27.

For, an "angel of the Lord," it says, "will encamp in a circle around those who fear him and will rescue them."[53] And through the voice of the saints it has been said to every holy person who has chosen to do good, "He will command his angels about you to protect you in all your ways."[54] And indeed, the all-wise Paul says about them, "Aren't they all ministering spirits sent to serve on behalf of those who will inherit salva-
[275] tion?"[55] And the Savior and Lord of the universe himself says at one point: "You shall see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."[56]

4.11 These [angels] remove the sinful beasts from us, dragging away from their savagery those captured by them, and they teach us how to make the path leading to each and every praiseworthy thing easy and accessible. These [angels], along with us, glorify the God over all, for it has been written: "Bless the Lord all his angels […]; bless the Lord all his powers, his servants doing his will."[57] These are the ones who teach us to bring the honors, the worship, not to themselves, but instead only to the God who is over all.

Furthermore, what I have said receives confirmation from the sacred writings. For an angel of the Lord once appeared to Gideon and said to him,

> "The Lord will be with you, and you will strike Midian as though it were only one man." And Gideon said to him: "If I found compassion in your eyes and if you will do for me today everything we have been discussing, do not depart from here until I come to you, and I will bring out a sacrifice and will place it before you." And he said: "I am [here], I shall sit down until you return." And Gideon went inside and prepared the kid of a goat and an ephah of wheat flour and unleavened bread, and he set the
> [276] meat in a basket, and he put broth in the pot, and he brought these things to him under the terebinth tree. And [Gideon] approached. And the angel of the Lord said to him: "Take the meat and the unleavened bread and set it on that rock, and pour out the containers of broth." And he did so.[58]

In addition, God also spoke one time to Manoah through an angel and usefully mentioned something that was about to happen; and again, it has been written as follows in the book of Judges: "And Manoah said to the angel of the Lord: 'Let us detain you here, and we shall prepare the kid of a goat before you.' And the angel of the Lord said to Manoah: 'If you detain me, I will not eat from your loaves; and if you prepare a whole burnt offering, you will offer it up to the Lord.' […] And Manoah took

[53] Ps 33(34):8. [54] Ps 90(91):11. [55] Heb 1:14. [56] John 1:51. [57] Ps 102(103):20–21.
[58] Judg 6:16–20.

the kid of the goat and the sacrifice," it says, "and offered them up to the Lord on the rock; and the angel set apart the doing of it."[59]

4.12 You see how they do nothing at all to hinder those who are determined to be pious from honoring the master of the universe with what was in their hand, but instead they teach that it would be appropriate for them to ascribe honors not to those under yokes [of ministry] and ranked among the servants[60] but rather to the Lord.[61] For the phrase, "Set it under the shelter of[62] that rock," I think, means nothing other than clearly saying, "Offer it to Christ." For, "the rock was Christ," as the all-wise Paul says.[63] In addition, [the angel of the Lord] says, "If you prepare" a "kid," you prepare it "for the Lord." And although he received [only] this instruction, it was once more upon the rock that he offered the sacrifice, since he [277] knew that Christ was called a "rock" on account of the steadfastness with which the divine nature is attached to those honors appropriate to it.

If, therefore, God truly subordinated the nations to "*city-guarding gods*," why was it not to him that they commanded the nations to bring offerings instead [of to themselves]? But, as it is, having entirely led us astray from service under him and instead having prevented us from knowing him at all, they have ascribed to themselves the acts of worship, the prayers of all, the confessions, the praises, the gifts.

Moreover, they have persuaded [the nations] to descend to such a point of vulgarity and unholy audacity as even to choose to carry out blood sacrifices for them, a practice that would especially prove that the daemons are hardly good but instead corrupt, and entirely removed from all good behavior. **4.13** Porphyry, for example, writes as follows about them in the second book of *On Abstinence from Ensouled Things*:

> And yet, even the whole of sorcery is accomplished by the opposite [beings].[64] For people who <enact> evils through deeds of sorcery

[59] Judg 13:15–16, 19.

[60] Gk.: λειτουργοῖς; cf. Ps 103(104):4, quoted at *c. Iul.* 3.36.12–13, where this designation is applied to angels.

[61] At *C. D.* 10.19 Augustine similarly highlighted the refusal of angels to accept worship directed to themselves.

[62] Gk.: ὑπό (oddly, Cyril has shifted the preposition used in Judg 6:20, πρός, quoted above at *c. Iul.* 4.11.22; cf. the use of ἐπί at Judg 13:19, quoted above at *c. Iul.* 4.11.32).

[63] 1 Cor 10:4.

[64] Porphyry had been discussing the activity of beneficent daemons in the sentences immediately preceding this quotation (conveniently omitted from Eusebius' lengthier quotations of the *Abst.* 2.38–42 at *P.e.* 4.22), so the "opposite" had originally been intended to contrast a wicked class of daemons from a good one. Incidentally, Eusebius and other Christian writers frequently would use the epithet ἐναντίοι in reference to powers or beings "opposing us/God" (cf., e.g., Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.26.5; *Ps.* 88:9–11 [PG 23.1088a]).

[278] especially honor their presider, too, along with them. <For> the daemons are <full> of every illusion[65] and are capable of deception through the working of marvels; it is with their help that people possessed of an evil daemon prepare spells and love charms. For all lack of restraint and hope of wealth and glory come through them, and especially deception. In fact, they are at home with falsehood, since they want to be gods and their presiding power wants to appear as <the supreme> God; these are the ones who rejoice "in both libation and savory aroma,"[66] the very same things that fatten their bodily and pneumatic part. For this part lives by vapors and smoke arising in a variety of ways and from a variety of sources, and they are empowered by the savory aromas coming from blood and flesh.

For this reason, a man of understanding and prudence will avoid performing such sacrifices, by which he will attract such beings to himself; and he will be eager to purify his soul in every possible way. For they do not attack a pure soul because of its unlikeness to them.[67]

4.14 Elsewhere, Porphyry also pretends to want to cross-examine one of the false prophets, or rather priests, from Egypt about the causes [of daemonic behavior] and to resolve to learn the cruelty of the daemons' [279] moral perversity, speaking as follows: "How can theosophists present them as subject to passions and enjoying obscene speech and other such vices?"[68] And he explains the distinctiveness of the evil inherent in them by saying,

> They posit that there is a subordinate race external [to the soul],[69] which is of a deceptive nature, taking all forms and shifting in character,[70] feigning to be gods, daemons, and souls of the dead; and everything that seems to be good or bad is brought about through them. Since, [as the theosophists posit,] this race quite simply cannot contribute to those things that are

[65] Gk.: φαντασίας.

[66] Homer, *Il.* 9.500; cited also by Plato, *R.* 2.364e1 and echoed at *Il.* 4.49 = *Il.* 24.70 (which is quoted below at *c. Iul.* 4.15.5).

[67] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.41.5–2.43.1 (2.41.5–2.42.3 had been cited already at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.22.10–12 and *Abst.* 2.43.1–2 at *P.e.* 4.18; *Abst.* 2.41.5–2.42.3 is also cited by Theodoret at *Affect.* 3.60 and *Abst.* 2.43.1 at *Affect*. 10.16). The emendations given in the translation in carrot brackets are drawn from the independent manuscript tradition and Eusebius.

[68] A rather loose citation of Porphyry, *Ep. Aneb.* fr. 1.2c Sodano = fr. 13a Saffrey and Segonds (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 5.10.10; cf. Iamblichus, *Myst.* 1.11ff).

[69] Based on Augustine's paraphrase of this same passage (*C. D.* 10.11.22–31 = fr. 65j; see the note of Saffrey and Segonds *ad loc*.), it seems likely that the exteriority of Porphyry's statement is in terms of the soul; see Saffrey and Segonds 2012, 38. Cf. *Comm. Tim.* frs. 10 and 17 Sodano.

[70] Gk.: πολύτροπον, which recalls the famous, if infrequent, Homeric epithet for Odysseus at Homer, *Od.* 1.1 and 10.330, on which Porphyry dedicated significant (and positive) attention in his *Quaest. Homer. in Od.* 1.1. For its disputed meaning in antiquity, see Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 1: 69–70.

> essentially good, which are in the soul,[71] nor can they know these things, they instead devote themselves to evil and mock and often obstruct those who are training in virtue; they are full of hot air[72] and enjoy sacrificial smoke and flattery.[73]

Surely, Julian ought, therefore, to be able to see clearly that Porphyry, who was his like-minded co-superstitionist,[74] revealed the true views about daemons. For he claims that they "devote themselves to evil," they resist those wanting to achieve virtue, "and they enjoy sacrificial smoke" and take great delight in blood sacrifices. [280]

4.15 Furthermore, we shall find that Homer's gods, too, desired so disgraceful an honor, if, that is, this type of thing should even be thought of as something honorable at all. For Zeus says,

> Never was my altar lacking an equal feast
> of libation and savory aroma;[75] for we have obtained this reward.[76]

And the Argives also used to sacrifice:

> Solid black bulls to the dark-haired shaker of the Earth.[77]

It is perhaps tedious to go through all the details, since no one is unaware that all their gods, or rather loathsome and unclean daemons, delight in "libations and savory aromas"; for the inspired David would not lie when he says, "All the gods of the nations are daemons."[78]

"Yes," Julian says, "but nonetheless if you censure the sacrifices of the Greeks and hold that the practice is worthy of much blame you will, it

[71] This phrase ("which are in the soul") is lacking from the parallel report of this passage in Augustine, *C. D.* 10.11 and Boulnois (SC 582, 348) suggests it is Cyril's gloss (as apparently do Saffrey and Segonds, fr. 62, p.39, where the clause is enclosed by brackets). It should be noted, however, that Cyril purports to be giving a direct quotation, whereas Augustine claims only to offer a synopsis of the entire *Epistle to Anebo*.

[72] Gk.: τύφου, which can designate either smoke or haughtiness; "hot air" attempts to get at both connotations.

[73] Porphyry, *Ep. Aneb.* fr. 2.7 Sodano = fr. 62 Saffrey and Segonds (cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 10.11.22–31 = fr. 65j Saffrey and Segonds; Iamblichus, *Myst.* 3.31, p.175). For discussion of the parallels, including the judgment (surely correct) that Cyril preserves Porphyry's original wording, see Saffrey and Segonds 2012, 38, 51–52.

[74] On the pairing of Julian and Porphyry, see also *c. Iul.* 3.21 with note.

[75] This phrase echoes *Il.* 9.500 (already alluded to in a quotation of Porphyry at *c. Iul.* 4.13.11).

[76] Homer, *Il.* 4.48–49 = *Il.* 24.69–70; these two lines are not cited together by any other author of late antiquity. However, the single line 4.49 = 24.70 was cited by Clement, *Prot.* 2.41.3 (cf. 18.2), while shorter phrases in these two lines were more frequently cited (see the references provided in the GCS apparatus).

[77] Homer, *Od.* 3.6. This Homeric line is quoted very rarely in antiquity and never by a Christian author.

[78] Ps 95(96):5.

would seem, entirely have to indict Moses' law too. For he has ordained that they slaughter sheep and use the same *methods*[79] when bringing offerings to God." Come, then, speaking with as much subtlety as possible, let us investigate what method was used in the instruction[80]
[281] provided by the law and what God was aiming at when he permitted the ancients to practice blood sacrifice.

4.16 Well then, it was a sort of accommodation,[81] not the institution of a necessary practice.[82] For, on the one hand, someone who loves blood sacrifices would not only gladly welcome those who wanted to perform these sacrifices and offer them but would also honor the act with an unqualified approbation[83] and in fact incite them to do this without ceasing; and even more he would demand it as something necessary, with all people owing him this honor and anyone slipping into laxity in such matters being punished for their reluctance. But, conversely, someone who was demonstrating that the practice was neither necessary for their edification nor, indeed, even what he wanted,[84] would avoid letting those who worship in this way go without rebuke, but rather would even censure them and at the necessary time prevent them from bringing offerings and in a sense toiling in vain, and would set them on a better course when they thought they could become renowned based upon something entirely useless. For "why," he says, "do you bring me frankincense from Saba and cinnamon from a distant land? Your whole burnt offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices do not delight me."[85] And again on this matter: "For who
[282] sought these things from your hands? You shall not continue trampling upon my court. If you should bring fine wheat flour, it would be futile. Incense is abhorrent to me."[86]

He said also through another prophet: "Gather your whole burnt offerings along with your sacrifices and eat meat; because I did not speak to your fathers about whole burnt offerings and sacrifices on the day that I brought them up from the land of Egypt."[87] For God was not in need of

[79] Gk.: τρόπων; the term "methods" here anticipates Julian's usage at *c. Gal.* fr. 71.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.11), which Cyril echoes frequently throughout books 9 and 10; see, e.g., *c. Iul.* 9.13.18; 9.14.2–3; 9.26.4–5, 17; 9.40.18–19; 10.27.11; 10.28.2–3; 10.30.3, 19; 10.40.51.

[80] Gk.: παιδαγωγίας. [81] Gk.: οἰκονομία.

[82] The argument of the next two sections (*c. Iul.* 4.16–17) will be revisited at greater length at *c. Iul.* 9.26–31.

[83] Gk.: ψήφῳ.

[84] Similar statements about the law and its ordinances not being "wanted" by God can be found at *c. Iul.* 9.23.11; 9.26.21; fr. 39. Augustine argues similarly at *C. D.* 10.5.

[85] Jer 6:20. [86] Isa 1:12–13; cited also by Theodoret, *Affect.* 7.28. [87] Jer 7:21–22.

blood, nor, indeed, was he seeking gross and material[88] worship; rather, he seeks a subtle and intellectual worship – namely worship "in spirit"[89] accomplished by means of every virtue, which is the good and inviolable way of life made conspicuous by the honorable distinctions that come from good behavior. And, in addition, he seeks the pure contemplation of him, the intelligible fragrance of doctrines with an edge honed to a straight and true point,[90] and the trustworthy and irreproachable knowledge of that which is really good. [283]

4.17 But since it was practically impossible for Israel, who had only just recently been drawn away from their slavery to shameful and unholy customs in Egypt and the indecency of the people there, and whose mind was still practically impotent and feeble, and did not yet know how to walk with youthful vigor – I mean with respect to the ability to pursue the path of the exceptional life, which lay so high above them, and to reach the furthest achievements (I mean, spiritual achievements) – God established the Mosaic law for them like a caregiver for a child, and ordained that they leave behind the polytheistic error, but he meanwhile allowed them to follow their former custom and honor him with what was at hand, presenting to him thank offerings and sacrifices that were ordained in a wise and skillful manner, so that they might reveal the truth beforehand as though through types and shadows. For the law possesses the "form of truth"[91] and the mystery of Christ is sketched through it. [284]

Moreover, the first steps in a field of knowledge in a sense always fall short of the complete comprehension of the subject; instead they bring one up gradually to a state of perfection, by establishing and supplementing [one's learning] little by little, and carrying the movement of our thinking upwards to a more solid state by advances towards what is better, as though by a flight of stairs.[92]

[88] The phrase "gross and material" (παχεῖαν καὶ ἔνυλον), incidentally, seems only to occur in Neoplatonic philosophers roughly contemporary with Cyril and after; see, e.g., Syrianus, *in Metaph.* p.25, 34 Kroll; Proclus, *Comm. Tim.* 1.155.10; 1.441.20; 2.8.24; 2.10.4; 3.114.16; 3.141.3; *in Cra.* 170.6; *in R.* 1.119.11 (the phrase also occurs at Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 55.8 Sodano, but the precise wording of this fragment might be vitiated by the fact that it is preserved only in the paraphrase of Proclus' own *Comm. Tim.* 1.440.1).

[89] Cf. John 4:23, 24. Cyril's attention to worship "in spirit and in truth" was pervasive, especially in his earlier works, and he even composed a lengthy treatise in seventeen books entitled *On the Worship in Spirit and in Truth* (PG 68.133–1126; Villani 2021); in *c. Iul.*, see 9.25.17; 10.23.15–17.

[90] Gk.: δογμάτων τῶν ἀπεξεσμένων εἰς τὸ εὐθύ τε καὶ ἀληθές. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.

[91] Rom 2:20.

[92] Cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 10.14, where the giving of the law is also compared to an early developmental stage in an individual's educational process.

And so it is in this case too: since, as I said, Christ the Savior of us all shone upon us at the necessary time, that which was in types has been abolished and the impotence of the shadow,[93] consisting as it did "in letters,"[94] has been brought to an end. For he himself is the same one who was sketched in that [outline] for those people long ago. Therefore, he stopped the blood sacrifices that had been conceded to the ancients as exercises to accommodate[95] them and had fulfilled the role of early childhood education. For Christ said: "God is spirit and those who worship him must worship in spirit and in truth."[96]

4.18 Furthermore, [God] will make clear that, even from the outset, the force of the worship according to the law was not, in his view, free from blame and accusation when he says through the all-wise Moses himself, who was the mediator of the law,

[285] > But if the Lord God shall destroy the nations into which you shall go in that place to inherit their land, and if you inherit them and dwell in their land, take heed for yourself lest you seek to follow them. After their destruction from before you, do not seek out their gods saying, "In the manner that the nations do these things for their gods, I too shall do the same." You shall not do these things in this way for the Lord your God; for the abominations, which the Lord hated, these they did for their gods, in that they even burned their sons and their daughters in fire for their gods.[97]

He thus forbids blood sacrifices, since those who did not know him have done these things for their gods. What's more, he adds an accusation of a thing which is truly heinous and unholy and violates the very laws of nature, namely the slaughter of their sons and daughters for these gods.[98]

O the great inhumanity of the "*city-guarding gods*"! O their dreadful cruelty and beastly thinking! For, when it comes to humans, they often set themselves in opposition to those who have grieved them and attack their enemies with wrath of equal measure, but whenever harm is about
[286] to come to children, they restrain their anger and pity each other's offspring. But, in contrast, those gods who, as Julian says, administer human affairs "*in a way corresponding*" to themselves[99] and according to the nature and mindset each one has, turn into child-killers those people who wronged them in no way at all but on the contrary even sought to

[93] Gk.: σκιᾶς, which equally connotes an outline or silhouette, as it is translated in the subsequent sentence ("sketched").
[94] 2 Cor 3:7. [95] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς. [96] John 4:24. [97] Deut 12:29–31.
[98] Cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.10.4; 4.15.4–9.
[99] Cyril here echoes the language of *c. Gal.* fr. 21.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.13) above.

honor them; they delight in the blood of humans; and when they see their own worshipper killed on unholy altars they consider it a delicacy.

Now, someone will perhaps say we have spoken nonsense and laid a groundless indictment against them, since in fact this never happened. Let us see, then, basing ourselves on the Greek historians, whether or not it is true that the altars and sanctuaries of their gods used to be stained with the blood and gore of humans.

4.19 For, Aristomenes the Messenian used to offer 300 corpses at the same time as thanks to the Zeus named after Mount Ithome, and in addition to these he even included the king of the Lacedaemonians – Theopompus, that is.[100] "The highest" and most excellent "of the gods"[101] is for this reason admirable! For in all likelihood he used to smile[102] upon men perishing in a horrible way, when he saw his own "altar" filled with "an equal feast."[103] In fact, it was their custom to revel in the misfortunes of humanity. [287]

Moreover, the Scythians around the Tauric Chersonese, who slaughtered guests they had captured for their Artemis, used to attach their heads to the gates of the temple,[104] bringing the slaughter of a man as a fair catch for the goddess and a gift of hospitality well-pleasing to her,[105] so that she might be revealed as harsher even than the sea and the very waves, snatching away those seeking refuge and, for those who came to anchor at that land, making their hope of being saved an occasion for their death.

Furthermore, Dorotheus the historian, in the fourth book of his *History of Italy*, claims that Erechtheus in Athens cruelly slaughtered his own daughter for the daemons under the earth.[106] Monimus, too, records in his collection of marvelous tales that some people in Pellene of Thrace

[100] Cyril follows the report on Aristomenes and Theopompus in Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.2 (quoted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12) relatively closely, as is hinted by Cyril's inadvertent "he adds" (προσετίθει, translated above as "in addition … he included"). Theodoret, *Affect.* 7.43 only recites the report on Aristomenes.

[101] An allusion to Homer, *Il.* 19.258; 23.43; *Od.* 19.303.

[102] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 5.426; 15.47.

[103] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 4.48; 24.69.

[104] This additional touch does not seem to be in any of Cyril's sources (although Ammianus [22.8.32–34] says that the Taurians near "Cherronesus" affix their victims' skulls to the "walls of the temple" [*fani parietibus*] of Diana).

[105] Note the sarcasm of Cyril's observation that guests are sacrificed as a gift to the goddess in a tragic reversal of hospitality. The alleged Scythian practice was well-known from Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (though it is unclear if Cyril had read the play); cf. Herodotus 4.103.1–2; Strabo 7.3.6; Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.3 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12); Origen, *Cels.* 5.27; Athanasius, *Gent.* 25.

[106] Cyril has accidentally conflated a notice from Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.7 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12), in which Demaratus is said to be the historian informing us of Erechtheus' human sacrifice, whereas Dorotheus spoke of [Gaius] Marius' human sacrifice.

were sacrificed to Peleus and Chiron.[107] And indeed also they claim that the Lesbians drenched the altar of Dionysus with the blood of men.[108]
[288] Moreover, when the Greek superstition was still at its peak, gladiatorial[109] contests used to be performed at special times among the Romans, and hidden underground was a certain [statue of] Cronus, with its gaping mouth facing upwards through perforated stones in order that he might be defiled by the gore of the one who had fallen.[110]

4.20 Porphyry, too, again writes in the second book of *On Abstinence from Ensouled Things* as follows:

> History, at any rate, has passed down the record not only of those people mentioned by Theophrastus but also of a great many others who likewise sacrificed humans long ago […].[111] And [to show] that we say this not simplistically but because history is full of them, it will be sufficient also to present the following. For on Rhodes, too, a human being used to be sacrificed to Cronus on the sixth day at the beginning of the month Metageitnion […].[112] And in what is now Salamis but was before called Koronis, a human used to be sacrificed in the month of Aphrodisios, as the Cypriots call it, to Agraulos the daughter of Cecrops and the nymph Agraulis. And the custom persisted until the time of Diomedes; then it was changed so that it was to Diomedes that the man was sacrificed. Both
> [289] the temple of Athena and that of Agraulos and Diomedes lie under a single precinct. And the one being slaughtered would run around the altar three times, led by the ephebes; then the priest would strike him with a

[107] Cyril is either correcting or carelessly transmitting the information given by Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.4 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12), who states that it was "an Achaean man in Pella of Thessaly," who performed the sacrifice (rather than "some people in Pellene of Thrace," as Cyril has it).

[108] Cf. Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.5 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12).

[109] Gk.: μονομαχίας.

[110] Cyril's source for this unique piece of information is unclear. Reports of human sacrifice to Cronus, however, do occur elsewhere (e.g., Diodorus Siculus 20.14; Plutarch, *Superst.* 171cd; Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.27.2; 2.54.2; 2.56.1–2 [quoted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16]; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9.2–3; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.24); see Clark 2000b, 151 n. 273; Rives 1994; Griffiths 1948, esp. 419–20. The alleged uncovering of child sacrifice in Alexandria itself was reported by Rufinus, *H.e.* 11.24. Boulnois, SC 582, 576–78 (following Cumont) sees Cyril's statement here as a confused reference to the ritual *taurobolium* (in which a bull had its throat slit while standing on perforated wood so that its blood would provide a sanguinary baptism for initiates "hiding" beneath the boards; see Prudentius, *Perist.* 10.1005–49). It is important to note, however, that Cyril refers to: a concealed Cronus, not a human; drilled or pierced stones, not floorboards; and human, not animal, sacrifice (at least, that is strongly implied by the context).

[111] Cyril omits a short notice that is important for Porphyry's (but not for the apologist's) argument: "of course one should not for this reason eat humans!" In other words, Porphyry defends vegetarianism even against the possibility that humans do owe animal sacrifices to the gods, although he strongly disputed the claims for animal sacrifice; the performance of an animal sacrifice does not require the eating of that sacrifice.

[112] Here Cyril omits two sentences on the Rhodian human sacrifice stating that the custom has since been altered but had originally involved slitting the throat of a condemned criminal at the beginning of the Cronian festival.

> lance in the throat, and thus they would make a whole burnt offering of him upon a pyre that had been set ablaze.[113]

And after other things [Porphyry writes]:

> Both on Chios and on Tenedos, they used to sacrifice a human to Dionysus by tearing him apart, as Euelpis the Carystian says. Next, Apollodorus says that the Lacedaemonians, too, used to sacrifice a human to Ares. The Phoenicians, when they were in great misfortunes, either from war, pestilence, or drought, used to sacrifice one of their dearest to Cronus by the casting of a vote.[114]

And after other things [Porphyry writes]:

> Istros, in his *Compendium of Cretan Sacrifices*, says that the Curetes long ago used to sacrifice children to Cronus.[115]

4.21 The altars of their gods, therefore, used to be stained by the blood of wretched humans. But perhaps one of those who cares about the customs of the Greeks might say: "Yes, men have, at times, been slaughtered, but those who were accustomed to do this weren't offering them to gods, but rather to wicked daemons who are to be averted."[116] Where, then, shall we put Cronus and Zeus, Ares and the haughty "arrow-pouring"[117] sister of Apollo, and the son of Semele, the thunderstruck Dionysus,[118] who are still even now[119] being worshipped or even perhaps

[113] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.53.3b–54.3. Eusebius had quoted the entirety of *Abst.* 2.54.1–2.56.9, thus demonstrating that, if Cyril had originally been prompted by Eusebius to quote from this passage of Porphyry, he not only went back to Porphyry in order to include most of the final sentence of 2.53.3 (omitted by Eusebius) but also abbreviated his quotation in three further places (where Eusebius had not); see Grant 1964, esp. 272–75. Theodoret, *Affect.* 7.41–42 quotes or closely paraphrases the Porphyrian passage (almost certainly drawing on Eusebius).

[114] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.55.3–56.1a.

[115] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.56.2.

[116] Gk.: πονηροῖς … καὶ ἀποτροπαίοις δαίμοσι. The adjective ἀποτρόπαιος originally conveyed the notion of "turning away" evil (in an active sense) but in the Hellenistic period and later could alternatively convey the notion of "that which ought to be turned away" (in a passive sense), as here. The contrary possibilities mark a point of contention between Cyril and Julian, both here and again in book 9; see *c. Iul.* 4.22 and 9.13–18. For discussion, see variously Riedweg 2012, 456–58; Boswell 2021.

[117] A common epithet of Artemis, e.g., at Homer, *Il.* 5.53.

[118] Dionysus had been born "with the lightning flame for midwife" (Euripides, *Ba.* 3, trans. by Dodds in his commentary) after his mother, pregnant from Zeus but tricked by Hera to compel him to come to her in all his glory, was blasted by Zeus's glorious and thunderous advent. Cyril shows no clear knowledge of Euripides' version of the tale (for, although *c. Iul.* 7.17.20–21 is strikingly close to Euripides, *Ba.* 349, the phrase may have been something of a cliché by Cyril's time).

[119] Such a reference to ongoing pagan practices (in Alexandria itself?) recurs elsewhere in this work; cf. *c. Iul.* 4.22.9–14; 7.37.1–15; 10.40.34–35. For a survey of the attempts at abolishing pagan sacrifices in late antiquity, see Trombley 2001, vol 1, pp.1–97; for the gradual processes of Christianization in late antique Alexandria and Egypt, see ibid., 11: 1–51, 205–40. On anti-pagan policies of Theodosius II specifically, see Millar 2006, 116–23.

are preeminent among the gods, to whom also the elite ranks of the Greeks say that blood sacrifices have been brought? They should, there-
[290] fore, either admit that they are unholy and wicked daemons who are to be averted,[120] or they will have to insist that they are gods and so join us in indicting them for having altogether reached the pinnacle of cruelty and for not letting the daemons outdo them in their disgusting behavior, or rather for having already been proven by the present facts themselves to be none other than hateful daemons who are to be averted.[121]

Furthermore, they ought to answer this question: What was the goal of those who sacrifice? Was it to prevent something terrible from happening to them that they became murderers? Yet we all naturally regard this sort of thing to be abominable, profane, and worthy of the most extreme guilt. And if someone should become the unholy murderer even of his own children, how is it not the case that his fortunes are rushing onward to the heights of wretchedness and to the deepest depths of misery? For what suffering could be worse than for someone to have their child utterly perish and fall miserably by the hand of their own father? That wild[122] Scythian woman, namely the daughter of Aietes, who was a twittering witch,[123] loved her man at first.[124] But when the charms of her licentiousness unexpectedly failed, she became a child-killer and a myth
[291] for human life and a subject of tragic theatre.[125]

4.22 Such fortunes are what the polluted and profane daemons, those masterminds behind everything wicked, graciously give to their respective worshippers. These are the ones who, according to them, have presided over human affairs, along with gods and angels, by the permission of God the Craftsman of the universe. "If, as you yourselves maintain, it was not to gods but instead to wicked daemons needing to be averted[126] that the ancients used to bring blood sacrifices, consisting not only of humans but also of irrational animals, for whom then," I would ask, "did you build temples throughout every land and city and for

[120] Gk.: ἀποτροπαίους. [121] Gk.: ἀποτρόπαιοι.

[122] Gk.: ἀγρία, which can denote a trait both of being uncivilized and of being cruel.

[123] Gk.: μάγον.

[124] Cyril alludes to the well-known story of Medea, who murdered her own children to punish Jason (their father) for abandoning her. The story was well-known in late antiquity; see, e.g., Libanius, *Progymn.*, 1.3.

[125] For similar language, see Cyril, *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.461d): οἱ δὲ διολώλασιν ἔσθ' ὅτε, καὶ τοῦ πρὸς λῆξιν ἰόντος ἔμπλεω κακοῦ, μῦθος τῷ βίῳ γεγόνασι, καὶ σκηνῆς ὑπόθεσις τραγικῆς. For the single phrase μῦθος τῷ βίῳ γεγόνασι, cf. Josephus, *BJ* 6.207 (with reference to a mother about to cannibalize her infant); Gregory of Nyssa, *Deit.* PG 46.568d (with reference to Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac).

[126] Gk.: ἀποτροπαίοις.

whom did you set up altars therein?" Yet how could it not be clear to everyone that even up to our own times they used to sacrifice[127] in every temple, and there was no one among them – small, great, uneducated, wise, those holding the highest office, those in a lowlier position with nothing noteworthy about them – no one who did not practice such shameful and bloodthirsty sacrifices always and in every way?

Hence, it is the wicked daemons that they have served; if, however, the daemons had to be averted,[128] as they themselves say, shouldn't they have attempted to accomplish this by desiring to attach themselves[129] to the Father and Craftsman of the universe?[130] This could be done – and it would be quite correct to do so – if one were to give consideration to [292] wanting to live rightly and irreproachably and to seeking to become like the all-holy God through a yearning and eagerness for each and every good thing. For it is in this way that we shall be superior to their perversity and impregnable to their assaults.

4.23 And scripture is full of witnesses to this: for it has been written that, an "angel of the Lord will encamp in a circle around those who fear him and will rescue them."[131] But I shall also present the statements of the Greeks themselves. Now, we already mentioned Porphyry, who has written the following: "For this reason, a man of understanding and prudence will avoid performing such sacrifices, by which he will attract such beings to himself; and he will be eager to purify his soul in every possible way. For they do not attack a pure soul because of its unlikeness to them."[132]

And Hermes, who according to them is Thrice-Greatest, also used to regard the matter in the same light. In his *To Asclepius*, he likewise writes as follows about the unholy daemons, whom we must guard against and from whom we should flee with all haste:

> Piety is the only protection and it is a necessary one; for neither an evil [293] daemon nor Fate can ever overpower or control the pious, holy, and reverent person. For God rescues such a person, who is really pious, from every evil.[133]

[127] Note the use of the imperfect verb ἐτέλουν, indicating that such public sacrifices are a thing of the past. Cf. *c. Iul.* 7.37; *Is.* 18:1–2 (PG 70.441d) where the imperfect is similarly used.

[128] Gk.: ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι.

[129] The phrasing here is identical to *c. Iul.* 5.2.40.

[130] At *C. D.* 10.16, Augustine similarly argues that the best protection against evil daemons is to serve the one true God.

[131] Ps 33(34):8.

[132] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.43.1 (cited above at *c. Iul.* 4.13.15–18).

[133] *Corp.Herm.*, *Ascl.* 29, test. 2 Nock and Festugière; an abbreviated version of these lines in Greek is given by Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 2.15.6.

Why, therefore, have they disregarded what everyone agrees is entirely praiseworthy and inclined to what is worse, saying that it was necessary for them to offer sacrifices to loathsome daemons who are to be averted?[134] But since, as I said, it was to Cronus and Zeus, to Dionysus and Athena, and indeed also to Ares and the others that they used to bring such sacrifices, it is clear that they themselves, and no one but them, would be the wicked and corrupt daemons who are to be averted[135] and who have stolen the name of divinity.

4.24 But Julian, bringing yet another objection, adds to his attempts to think incorrectly and says,

Julian

For when it comes to laws, it is clear that the nature of a given people established them to correspond to itself – civic and humane ones corresponding to those in whom a humane disposition had been cultivated the most, but wild and inhumane ones corresponding to those whose underlying and inherent
[294] *character had the opposite nature. For legislators added little through their guidance to their natures and propensities. "The Scythians," therefore, did not accept Anacharsis*[136] *"in his Bacchic revels."*[137] *And among the western nations, you would have a hard time finding more than a very few people who had an aptitude for philosophy, or geometry, or other such pursuits, despite the fact that the Roman Empire has now ruled for such a long time; there are, it is true, some exceptionally gifted ones who take advantage merely of dialectic and rhetoric, but they take part in no other field of learning. So strong does nature seem to be.*

So then, what variation is there among the customs and laws of the nations?[138]

Cyril

4.25 Are you then going to argue that human nature is somehow not the same and that we should not predicate a single definition of substance for all humans? For, as you seem to think, we have not been made in the same way but instead differ essentially[139] in our respective

[134] Gk.: ἀποτροπαίοις. [135] Gk.: ἀποτρόπαιοι.
[136] In fact, it was Scyla; see Herodotus 4.79–80 (on Anacharsis, see Herodotus 4.76–77). Julian elsewhere alludes to the Scythians' stereotypical hostility to foreigners; see *Ep.* 89b (p.158.24–25 Bidez) (= "Letter to a Priest" [pp.304–05 Wright]).
[137] For the phrasing, see Herodotus 4.79–80. [138] *c. Gal.* fr. 22 Mas.; Wright 1923, 346–49.
[139] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς.

tendencies, such that, while one person happens to have been allotted a gifted and virtue-loving nature, another person instead is allotted a rather [295] shameful and quite loathsome nature. Where in this, then, would one discern the freedom of each person's mind? For it would no longer be up to us to do either good or bad, but we will be forced to go, involuntarily and without reflection, wherever the law of our natural propensity might carry us. And fighting against nature will be a challenge[140] – or rather, it will even prove impossible.

Even if, therefore, someone happens to be cruel and harsh, he has been forced to this condition by natural laws: the Scythian ought to be released from blame on this score and let everyone else, too, whose mind has inclined to what is harsh and bitter be released from blame. And if those who are wise in these matters establish laws in keeping with "*the propensities of their natures*,"[141] none of the Greeks and Romans should act like a barbarian,[142] I mean in terms of their character and undertakings, and, conversely, among the barbarians there should be a severe shortage of people who are gentle and wise, or even practitioners of justice. For it is impossible for nature to be forced into not being whatever it happens to be.

Furthermore, if some people, as Julian thus thinks, suffer from a natural defect, this state of affairs would, I suppose, be a clear indictment of the one who has brought them into existence. For [in this case] he has created wicked things, despite the fact that he is good by nature. How, [296] then, can we maintain that he who knows how to determine what is just has taken our affairs into account and that he has exercised providence for his own creations?[143] How is it not the case that he instead clearly committed an injustice if, in short, in some people's nature he implanted error, savagery, ignorance, and a lack of wisdom?

4.26 Nevertheless, the Aristotelian Alexander in the book *On Providence* says about God,

> Reason grasps that [the divine] continually and without interruption performs excellent and blessed activities, to which its very existence corresponds, and that providence over things here is exercised by it inasmuch as

[140] For this proverbial quip, see e.g., Philo, *Abr.* 1.193; Julian, *Mis.* 23.353a; Libanius, *Or.* 64.48.6; *Decl.* 48.68; Sopater, *Schol. ad Hermog.* 5, p.61.7 Walz.

[141] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 22.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.24.8). [142] Gk.: βαρβαριζέτω.

[143] Cyril here offers a retorsion of Julian's concern about the relationship of providence to ethnic difference (see *c. Gal.* fr. 21.25–29 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.2.29–33]; and *c. Gal.* fr. 24.10–23 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.33.9–22] below).

> it is good and is a doer of good. For benefiting others is a property of every good being.[144]

How, therefore, did the one who does good deeds benefit those who obtained from him by nature what does not even please him? For surely it is characteristic of a good being to will good things.

But perhaps Julian will say that defectiveness does not inhere in their nature as if necessity required it, but that laws have come to be that are instead similar to the nature of their customs. What, then, would this contribute towards his aim of proving that the nations were allotted to "certain *city-guarding and ethnarch gods*" or daemons and angels? For he
[297] nevertheless says, I think, that the inclination[145] of their thinking coheres with the habits and character of those allotted to rule over them; for, he says, *the nations governed by them correspond to the individual substance of their gods*."[146] Therefore, since the Scythians and certain others are cruel, haughty, and beastly in character, while there are other examples of shameful and ridiculous conduct honored by many of the nations, one has absolutely no way of avoiding the implication that those beings set over them, who "*govern*" them, are also like this. Is it then to these beings that God, the lover of virtue, would have yoked humanity whom he created for virtue?

Nevertheless, he says, "*the Scythians did not accept Anacharsis in his Bacchic revels*."[147] And what was the reason, Your Excellency, that they did not accept him? Was it because they belonged to a nature that had received inhumanity as its portion? Then how was a Scythian engaged in Bacchic revels? For Anacharsis himself was also a Scythian by race; and [yet] he is so admired among the Greeks for his wisdom that some even think that he, too, ought to be numbered among the Seven Sages.[148]

4.27 Moreover, since, as a supporting argument for his incorrect thinking on this matter, Julian condemns the lack of learning among "*the western nations*"[149] and claims that no expert[150] in the liberal

[144] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* fr. 4 Riedweg (= fr. 5 Grant = vers.arab. D18, pp.111–12 Thillet); on the Greek fragments of this work (found only in Cyril), see *c. Iul.* 2.38–39 with note. The final sentence was something of a commonplace by Cyril's time (although noted in Christian authors only by Titus of Bostra, *Man.* 3.10), apparently deriving ultimately from Lysias, *Or. XIX Pro Aristoph.* 59.5–6.

[145] Gk.: ῥοπήν. [146] *C. Gal.* fr. 21.14–15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.17–18).

[147] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 22.7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.24.9–10).

[148] Cyril's argument here is that, according to Julian's logic, Anacharsis, as one of the inhumane Scythians, should have been incapable by nature of possessing Greek qualities sufficient for the Greeks to admire him according to their own standards.

[149] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 22.7–12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.24.10–15). [150] Gk.: ἐπιστήμονα.

arts[151] exists among them except for just a few, come, let us say to him on this point: "How is it that even these few have a desire to learn at all when they have not been allotted this in their essence?[152] For if the things contrary to one's nature are inevitably unattainable and cannot be apprehended, how have these people entered into such domains?" [298]

Hence, for our part, we will hardly accuse the Craftsman of the universe of implanting into some people a natural defect – for it says, "God saw everything that he made, and behold everything was very good";[153] on the contrary, we shall instead assign the "*difference*" in the habits "*of the nations*"[154] to their customs, upbringings, and the founders of the races, who have arguably made the laws of each resemble their own ways of thinking.[155]

For example, it is effortless for those who want to do so to observe among both the Greeks and the Romans some people who are bad and have the worst sort of character, despite the fact that their laws conduct them towards each and every admirable thing, while in contrast the barbarians are not all simply wild but on occasion some of them have attained such a degree of uprightness and virtue that they too have obtained a reputation worthy of emulation.

4.28 For instance, Alexander, who is called Polyhistor, records in his *On Pythagorean Symbols* that Pythagoras studied under Zoroaster, an Assyrian by race.[156] The so-called prophets among the Egyptians also practiced philosophy, and, indeed, likewise the Chaldeans among the [299] Assyrians, the Druids among the Galatians, the Samanaeans from Persian Bactria, quite a few of the Celts, the Magi among the Persians, the Gymnosophists among the Indians, Anacharsis himself among the Scythians, and Zamolxis in Thrace.[157] And they say some even from the Hyperborean nations who dwell beyond the Ripaean Mountains are

[151] Literally, "the circle of studies" (τῶν ἐγκυκλίων τουτωνὶ μαθημάτων). [152] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς.

[153] Gen 1:31. [154] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.25 and 22.13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.29 and 4.24.16).

[155] The language here recalls Cyril's allusion at *c. Iul.* 4.25.15–17 to Julian's fragment 22.5–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.24.7–9): "those who are wise in these matters establish laws in keeping with '*the propensities of their natures*.'" Note that in his alternative account of the origin of diversity in human laws and habits offered here, Cyril has replaced "nature" with legislators' "ways of thinking" (γνώμαις) as that which determines the development of the laws for a given nation. For a position similar to that of Cyril here, Boulnois (SC 582, 380 n. 1) notes Theodoret, *Provid.* 7. Origen had previously argued that humans have a common nature and are all capable of practicing virtue, but have become evil due to their "upbringing, perversion, and environment" (*Cels.* 3.69).

[156] This report of Alexander Polyhistor (an historian and ethnographer of the first century BC) seems loosely derived from Clement, *Str.* 1.15.70.1.

[157] Except for the last two named individuals, this sentence follows closely Clement, *Str.* 1.15.71.4. Cyril could have been prompted to include Anacharsis and Zamolxis in this list from *Str.* 1.15.72.1 and 4.8.57.2, respectively (although the two had already been listed together in earlier literature).

stewards of justice and avoid dainty food and they do not keep a Sybaritic lifestyle,[158] but prefer to eat only fruits.[159] Aristobulus the Peripatetic[160] at one point says the following: "Indeed, all the things about nature said among the ancients are also said by those who philosophize outside of Greece, some by the Brahmins among the Indians and others by those in Syria called Jews."

This, too, is recorded:[161] they say that Hippa, who was the daughter of Chiron the centaur[162] and was married to Aeolus, taught her husband natural philosophy, having received this knowledge as a kind of inheri-
[300] tance from her father. And Euripides says about her,

> She first prophesied divine matters
> In oracles based upon the clear risings of the stars.[163]

But enough of this, lest our audience find my account tiresome by the addition of still more material. It should, nevertheless, certainly be clear that the inventions of Julian's mind are overflowing with ignorance. For in fact, we have not been bound to being good or defective by the laws of nature as if we were forced by necessity, but rather we naturally go "hither or thither"[164] with unrestrained free thoughts.

4.29 Now[165] our clever opponent who loves faultfinding and mockery, tossing and turning in every direction and constantly changing his argument from one thing to another at random, sarcastically attacks the

[158] On the proverbially gluttonous Sybarites, see *c. Iul.* 7.11.7–8 with note.

[159] Cyril here loosely follows Clement, *Str.* 1.15.72.2.

[160] Cyril incorrectly attributes the following quotation by Megasthenes (drawn from Clement, *Str.* 1.15.72.5) to Aristobulus (who had been mentioned at Clement, *Str.* 1.15.72.4); his mistaken attribution may be an indication that Eusebius was his intermediary, since the latter quotes Clement on Megasthenes and then immediately introduces a quotation from Clement on Aristobulus ("besides this, Clement further makes mention of Aristobulus the Peripatetic …, " *P.e.* 9.6.5).

[161] This and the next sentence follow fairly closely Clement, *Str.* 1.15.73.4–5.

[162] Chiron was the mythical centaur famed for his wisdom and medical knowledge and as the sometime mentor of Achilles; see, e.g., Homer, *Il.* 4.217–19; 11.828–32. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 37.12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.33.10).

[163] Euripides, *Melanipp. Sap.* fr. 4 Jouan and Van Looy (= fr. 483 Kannicht); these lines were previously cited by Clement of Alexandria (at *Str.* 1.15.73.5).

[164] Gk.: ἢ τὰν ἢ ἐπὶ τάν. Our translation is an attempt to preserve the archaic status of this proverbial phrase at the time Cyril was writing. It was originally a Spartan idiom meaning "come back either with your shield or on it" and was spoken to soldiers going to battle to highlight the only two acceptable outcomes of their military service. Apparently by Cyril's day the meaning of the phrase had shifted to refer to two mutually exclusive options, with one being good and the other bad. Cyril also uses the phrase at *c. Iul.* fr. 62.4 and *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.449d). He is, in fact, the earliest surviving author to use the phrase in this form. Afterwards it appears in Byzantine lexica and in the Suda which recounts its Spartan origin (Lambda, entry 824).

[165] For a useful articulation of the flow of the argument throughout the remainder of book 4, see Boulnois 2011a.

God-breathed scripture and, not understanding anything at all in it, again adds:

Julian

For indeed, Moses has given quite a mythical cause for the fact that languages are not alike.[166] *For he said "the sons of men," having come together, wished to* [301]
build "a city" and a great "tower" in it, and God declared that it was necessary to go down and "confuse their" languages.

And lest anyone think that I am falsely accusing him of these things, we shall read what comes next in the books of Moses: "And they said, 'Come let us build for ourselves a city and a tower, the top of which will go up to heaven, and let us make for ourselves a name before being scattered over the face of all the earth.' And the Lord came down to see the city and tower, which the sons of men built. And the Lord said, 'Behold, they are all one race and have one tongue, and they began to do this thing and now nothing that they might set themselves to do will fail. Come, let us go down there and confuse their language, in order that each of them might not understand the voice of his neighbor.' And the Lord God scattered them over the face of all the earth, and they ceased from building the city and tower."[167]

Do you then think it is right that we believe this story but you disbelieve what Homer says about the Aloadae, how they plotted to set three mountains upon each other, "in order that heaven might be scaled"?[168] *For my part, I* [302]
claim that this story is just as mythical as that one. But when it comes to you, if you accept the former, why, in the name of the gods, do you reject Homer's myth? For I suppose I should be silent in the presence of unlearned men[169]

[166] In referring to the "mythical cause" Moses gives for the variety in human language, Julian may be alluding to his belief that the story contains a hidden meaning, like other myths. If so, then he took a different view from Celsus, who held that the Babel story had no hidden truth (see Origen, *Cels.* 4.21). On Julian's view on the Bible and myth, see also *c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.29) with note.

[167] Gen 11:4–8; vv. 5–8 were quoted by Origen, *Cels.* 5.29.26–34.

[168] Homer, *Od.* 11.316b. In this passage, Homer has Odysseus briefly recount the tale of the two giant men Otus and Ephialtes, the children of Aloeus, who were killed by Apollo after they recklessly threatened to pile the mountains Ossa, Olympus, and Pelion on top of each other in order to climb to heaven (*Od.* 11.305–20). The possible parallel between the Aloadae and the Tower of Babel episode was already recognized before Julian; see, e.g., Philo of Alexandria, *Confus.* 4; Origen, *Cels.* 4.21; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 28.5. While he was residing in Antioch, during the same period he was composing *c. Gal.*, Julian was mocked by the Antiochenes for, among other things, taking large strides like the Aloadae; see Ammianus 22.14.3.

[169] While certainly sarcastic here, Julian is probably alluding to the more serious claim by many philosophers that truths concealed in mythical poetry were only accessible to the reader who was properly initiated in such philosophical "mysteries," as Boulnois has noted (see Boulnois SC 582, 386–88 n. 2). For similar language, but within a more extensive discussion of allegorical interpretation, see Julian, *c. Her.* 25.239a; cf. Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 27.148a; 37.152b; *ad deor. matr.* 1.158d; 12.173a.

about the fact that, even if all the humans throughout all the inhabited earth were to use a single language and tongue, they would not be able to build a city reaching to heaven, even if they were to make all the earth into bricks – for those who would have strength sufficient to reach as far as the orbit of the moon would require an endless supply of bricks of the same size as the entire earth. Let us assume for the sake of argument that all humans had come together, using a single tongue and language, and quarried the earth and made it into bricks: when would they ever reach up to heaven, even if it were stretched thinner than a thread as they unwound it like a ball of yarn?

[303] *Do you, then, still dare to boast in your knowledge of God when you believe to be true what is so clearly a myth and when your view of God is that he confused their languages because he was afraid of humans with murderous intent?*[170]

Cyril

4.30 What could be more vulgar than these sorts of ideas? For he supposed that the God beyond all was afraid of the attack of humans, and furthermore that he has gone down to confuse their tongues lest, after miraculously erecting a heaven-sized tower, they perhaps even depose him from his imperial throne. How then could God, who had reached the degree of cowardice suggested by that man who is so clever in his words, have descended to confuse their tongues and to watch the city and tower being set up? Or perhaps it's only to be expected that, so long as he remained on high and cherished his own throne, he would sustain injury from those with evil intent, but, if it was upon earth that he should wage war against them, he would easily suppress their uprising?
[304] Yet, someone gripped by fear, instead of willingly confronting those determined to fight against him, would typically have withdrawn and put as much distance as possible between himself and them.

And I am not unaware that I am being foolish by plunging myself into arguments about these matters; for the divine is omnipotent and nothing is impossible for him should he merely nod his head. But it was, nevertheless, necessary for me to show that, owing to his extreme lack of aptitude for learning, our opponent habitually delights in slander and is

[170] *c. Gal.* fr. 23 Mas.; Wright 1923, 348–51. By a slight emendation, Boulnois has opted in the last line for "a single language" (μίαν φωνήν instead of μιαιφονίαν, "murderous intent," given in the GCS), which makes more sense in this context; cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Conf.* 15 and 192, as well as Julian himself earlier in this fragment (*c. Iul.* 4.29.30 and 36); less elegant than Boulnois, mss κ and V read "sameness of language" (ὁμοφωνίαν). Unfortunately, Michael Glycas' report of this passage omits the phrase altogether ("not a little frightened at this," God prevented their construction of the tower; *Annales* 2, 241.14–17 Bekker).

spewing forth his arguments from a disabled intellect and a mind that has lost its grip on what is reasonable.

But he somehow pretends to give the requisite impression of plausibility by saying that those on earth, even if "*they were to make the whole of it into bricks*," would not be capable of "*reaching as far as the orbit of the moon*." Now we, too, hold that the attempt was futile for those at that time. But we must state the reason they did so.[171]

4.31 For in fact we maintain that it was not, as Julian thinks, because the God of the universe "*was afraid*" that he divided into a diversity of languages[172] those "*building the city*" or setting up "*the tower*" in it, but instead because he was benefiting them and curtailing their futile labors. For since the humans who had lived just before them were all utterly destroyed because of the great impiety ingrained within them when God [305]
let loose upon them the flood, for this reason they were afraid that, should they one day experience this again, they would undergo the same destruction as the previous generation and they began setting their hands to shameful and useless pursuits.[173] For, practically raising up their own mind in revolt against the divine purpose, the poor wretches were foolishly eager to erect a tower for themselves higher than the clouds; for they probably supposed that, by going up aloft, they would be impervious to suffering a flood, if in fact, as I said, one should perhaps come upon them again.[174]

You can see the error of those who lived at that time, their ineffectual plans, their pointless undertaking, their disregard for the doctrine concerning God. For first of all, it was impossible for him who had promised not to let loose a flood against those on the earth a second time ever to lie. For he spoke in this way to the inspired Noah: "I will not continue to curse the earth because of the actions of humans, because the thinking of humanity inclines intently towards wickedness from their youth."[175] But secondly, it was impossible for people to avoid God's omnipotent hand, if he should choose to punish the guilty. Therefore, to

[171] For the place of the following discussion within Cyril's interpretation of the Babel episode elsewhere in his corpus, see Borst 1957, 1.252–53.

[172] Gk.: πολυγλωσσίαν.

[173] For this interpretation of the motives for building the tower, which is otherwise relatively novel, see Augustine, *in Evang. Iohan.* 6.10. Some precedent may be found in the reference to the tower-builders imagining that God might send another cataclysmic flood (although this was not the motivation for their building) at Josephus, *AJ* 1.113–14, followed by Ps-Eustathius, *Hex.* PG 18.753b; see Boulnois, SC 582, 578–80. Cyril's interpretation of the Tower of Babel episode departs significantly from Origen's mystical reading of the passage as describing "the way in which souls became bound to a body" (*Cels.* 5.29–32).

[174] *c. Iul.* 4.30.25–31.14 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 856. [175] Gen 8:21.

keep them from neglecting those pursuits that were essential for their benefit and from choosing to devote the sweat of their brow to futile endeavors, God scattered them and implanted within them a clamorous noise,[176] contriving the remedy of foreign languages[177] instead of retribu-
[306] tion and punishment.[178]

4.32 Now, when indeed the sacred text says that those who lived at that time intended to raise the tower as high as heaven,[179] we hold that they certainly were not seriously planning to raise the edifice to heaven itself – for that is impossible. Rather, it is the custom of the God-breathed scripture to use the word "heaven" for "high up," in accordance with the common way of speaking among humans.[180] The inspired David, for example, sings a psalm and uses a hyperbolic expression for those sailing in the sea: "Those who go down into the sea on boats, plying their trade on many waters, they know the Lord's works and his marvels in the deep […]; they go up to the heavens, and they go down to the abysses."[181]

Since Julian has mentioned the Aloadae and calls that man a myth-maker whom he admires so much and who has passed on to him the origin even of the very gods whom he serves,[182] come and let us respond briefly to this point as well. Why is it amazing, dear sir, if there were some youths at the time outstanding in bodily strength, hot-blooded, haughty, full of disdain, who raised their eyebrow to heaven? Wanting to indicate the sort of character they had as a kind of lesson, at least as I understand it, Homer hyperbolically ascribes something great and preposterous to
[307] them, saying that it was doubtless their aim to make even heaven somehow "accessible" to themselves,[183] if, that is, they should prove able to put the highest of the mountains on top of one another.[184] But, the question of whether Homer lied about this story and tossed it in as something "mythical"[185] or if it has another explanation is no concern of ours.

[176] For "clamorous noise," cf. *c. Iul.* 7.22.10–11. [177] Gk.: ἑτερογλωσσίας ἐπινοήσας φάρμακον.
[178] *c. Iul.* 4.31.24–27 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 856. [179] Cf. Gen 11:4.
[180] For this claim to the hyperbolic use of "heaven" in the Bible, see also Origen, *Comm. in I Cor.* fr. 49.19–25 Jenkins; Augustine, *Loc. in Hept.* 1.35.
[181] Ps 106(107):23–24, 26.
[182] Gk.: τῶν θεῶν … τὴν γένεσιν. Cyril could be alluding to Homer's phrase "origin of the gods" (θεῶν γένεσιν, *Il.* 14.201, 302; alluded to at Plato, *Ti.* 40d–41a), while at the same time slipping into the well-known apologetic move of highlighting the births of the Greek gods at particular, usually late, historical moments; cf. e.g. Athenagoras, *Leg.* 18.3; Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2.3, 5; Tatian, *Or.* 21.2; Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 2.1 (which includes a quotation of *Il.* 14.201); Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.9–10; 2.1–6; Cyril, *c. Iul.* 1.11, 21.
[183] Homer, *Od.* 11.316; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 23.20–22 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.29.24–26).
[184] Cf. Cyril's interpretation of biblical giants at *c. Iul.* 9.12.33–49.
[185] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 23.22–23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.29.27).

But since Julian claims that "*you still dare to boast in your knowledge of God*"[186] by applying your mind to Moses' narratives, how, tell me, did [Moses] say something impossible took place? Let it be agreed that those who, due to their extreme folly, had planned to raise up the tower beyond the clouds, lost their sense of what is reasonable, and found their way into condemned modes of thinking, surely just like the two sons of Aloeus[187] did – what is that to God? If, therefore, Moses has written that God was afraid of this attempt of theirs, let Julian prove it and I will say nothing more. But if, on the contrary, God stopped some ignorant people from their futile endeavors, why does Julian unjustifiably rant and babble immoderately by adding the following?

Julian

4.33 *But I return once more to discuss that episode.*[188] *Now it is true that on the question of how God confused their languages, Moses said the cause for this was that he was afraid lest they do something against him by finding a way to scale heaven since they had a common language and mindset with each other;* [308] *and, on the question of how God accomplished this, [Moses said] he came down from heaven, since he was unable to do it from above, so it seems, without coming down to earth. But when it comes to the fact that there are differences in terms of customs and legal institutions, neither Moses nor anyone else gave a clear account of this.*

Yet, the difference in legal and civic institutions among the nations of humanity is in every respect greater than the difference in languages. For who among the Greeks holds that one ought to have intercourse with his sister, or who with his daughter, or who with his mother? But this is judged to be a good thing among the Persians.[189] *Why must I go through one by one the Germans' love of liberty and refusal of submission, or go through in detail the submissiveness and docility of the Syrians, Persians, Parthians, and quite simply all those* [309] *barbarians who dwell towards the east and the south, and all the nations that are perfectly happy to possess more despotic kingdoms?*

[186] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 23.34–37 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.29.40–43). [187] i.e., the Aloadae, mentioned above.

[188] As Boulnois notes (SC 582, 398 n. 1), this claim to return to the Tower of Babel episode indicates that Julian had left that biblical episode on the side and turned to some other discussion, the nature and duration of which Cyril unfortunately does not reveal.

[189] The ethnographic trope of Persian incest was frequently expressed in ancient literature, but had become especially significant in Christian apologetic literature, such as Clement, *Str.* 3.2.11.1, Origen, *Cels.* 5.27; 6.80, and Bardaisan, *Liber leg. Reg.* (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 6.10.16), as well as Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.4.6 (with which Julian was familiar); see Johnson 2006a, 206–08. In Julian's own corpus, see also *ad Const.* 7.9c. Cyril himself has already made mention of the topic above at *c. Iul.* 4.4.

If, therefore, these greater and more significant differences came to pass in the absence of a greater and more divine providence, why do we uselessly waste our effort and serve one who does not exercise providence?[190] *For does he who showed no concern for ways of life, habits, character, good laws, or political constitution still have a decent claim to our respect? Not at all!*

Look at what an absurd conclusion your doctrine comes to. For of all the goods found in human life, those of the soul lead the way, and those of the body follow.[191] *If, therefore, [God] so completely neglected goods related to our soul, neither showing providence for our physical make-up nor sending teachers or*
[310] *legislators to us as he did to the Hebrews under Moses and the prophets after him, what valid reason would we have to give thanks to him?*[192]

Cyril

4.34 Well then, we already stated above that Julian lies, swaggers about, and has filled his mind with nothing true about God. For, indeed, he supposes that the inviolate Intellect sometimes succumbs to fear and is incapable of dividing those on earth into a diversity of languages unless he came down to it, perhaps by abandoning the realms above and leaping off his transcendent throne. But I suppose someone might say in response: "You are speaking, dear sir, about God, who constructed this universe by certain indescribable operations and is beyond every intellect." The inspired David also sang to him: "Where shall I go from your Spirit, and where shall I flee from your presence? If I go up into heaven, you are there; if I descend into Hades, you are present."[193] For everything is full of him. And the Savior himself informs us of this point when he
[311] says: "'Don't I fill heaven and earth?' says the Lord."[194]

How, then, can Julian say without embarrassment that, "*unless he came down to earth*," God would not have been able to divide those who lived at that time into a diversity of languages? Or, perhaps, does he think that God really did descend bodily? Does he subject the incorporeal nature to corporeal laws? And does he believe that a being who is without quantity

[190] Cf. Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 21.25–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.29–31) with note.

[191] Although the division of goods of soul from goods of body had become commonplace in philosophical literature, Julian may be alluding to one of its earliest expressions in Plato, *Leg.* 3.697b2–6, a dialogue of special significance for him; see Bouffartigue 1992, 191–93; O'Meara 2003, 93–94, 120–23.

[192] *c. Gal.* fr. 24 Mas.; Wright 1923, 350–55.

[193] Ps 138(139):7–8.

[194] Jer 23:24b; cf. Origen, *Cels.* 4.5, 12, for a similar use of this verse. For Cyril's independent stance from Origen, see Boulnois 2011b, 827. It is unclear why Cyril attributes the passage to Jesus himself. Perhaps he confused it with a passage from the gospels or regarded the divine Word as the one speaking through the prophet.

or size and who is entirely exempt from any necessary limitation made use of movements from one place to another? But if Julian is actually sarcastically mocking the statement of Moses who wrote that the God of the universe came down to earth from above, he is unaware that Moses has used human words[195] in full awareness of the due limit placed upon [312]
speech by human nature; for there are no words that can rival God's glory.

4.35 Now since he busies himself[196] with the question of why one sees differences among the nations in terms of their habits and laws and where these differences came from and <insists> that Moses and the prophets who were born after him spoke nothing at all about these things, and since he then measures out the character traits that make up this difference, [insisting] that marrying one's mother and being keen to bed one's sister were greatly despised by the Greeks and Romans and yet this very behavior has been honored by others, and since, what's more, he accepts the Germans' unbridled disposition and of course the docility of others, and then indicts the God of the universe for indifference when it comes to our affairs if he himself was not the one who stipulated and legislated such shameful and rightly hated conduct – in light of all this, come, let us say to him: "You are wrong, man. For at that time, the state of monolingualism[197] was contributing to the destruction of those who had quite irrationally built for themselves the heaven-sized tower; therefore, the Craftsman of mind and word confused their tongues. Furthermore, how could the difference between the nations, with their lack of agreement in customs and character, be in harmony with God [313]
who loves what is good? For this latter state of affairs had its cause and birth, so to speak, in the fact that not everyone chose to honor the good and blameless life."

For we hold that human nature comes from the Craftsman of all, lacking no good thing and allotted the possession of a self-taught knowledge of what is beneficial.[198] Moreover, the God-breathed scripture supports our argument. Nevertheless, a great many pleasures and the onslaughts of manifold passions corrupt the heart and carry away each person's intellect from the reasonable way of thinking, and it was

[195] Philo, *Conf.* 134–36 had likewise claimed that this passage was using anthropomorphic language of God.

[196] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖ; for Julian's polemical use of this term, which Cyril may be reverting back onto Julian here, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[197] Gk.: ὁμοφωνίας.

[198] For a human's ability to be "self-taught" about what is good, see Cyril's description of Julian's position regarding the human conception of the divine at *c. Iul.* 2.23.3 (introducing *c. Gal.* fr. 7 Mas.) with note.

absolutely unavoidable that a person also be subject to whichever of the vices might have taken him captive. For the mind of every person is autonomous and free to do what it likes. As a result, even if some people have been trained by defective laws to have an incorrect disposition, they can easily and voluntarily change course to what is better and beneficial, since they are not hemmed in to what is more shameful by laws of nature, nor indeed compelled to what is contrary to their will by some sort of necessary attraction; rather, it is possible, as I said, for them freely
[314] to move to a better anchorage.

4.36 Why, therefore, does Julian say that we must suppose that God was involved in the dividing of the nations into different customs and laws? Yet, wouldn't everyone have to agree that, if the aim and intention of everyone on earth was to devote themselves to going through life in accordance with what pleased God, then all people, inclining unreservedly towards good deeds, would have one character, constitution, and law? But, since, as I said, we disregarded the life appropriate for humans and threw aside the better and most lawful constitution dear to God, and, like beasts, exchanged it for one that was more shameful and bodily – like "gold for bronze" according to Homer's myth[199] – and since we are overcome by manifold pleasures and fail to approach what is supremely beneficial, putting momentary gratification in front of what is edifying, it is for this reason that we differ in terms of our "*customs*" and "*character*," with some maintaining customs that are not entirely condemnable, while others maintain those that have obtained a worse verdict.

And so Julian should not for this reason indict God for allegedly "*neglecting providence*" in our affairs and being unconcerned with "*our physical make-up*."[200] For if he had in mind that certain members of the human race have been allotted a different natural origin and are not of a nature like ours, it seems to me his argument would no longer be about
[315] humans. For, if they are excluded from the definition and account of what it means to be human, they would no longer be like us – how could they be? – but would be some kind of animal with a different nature and in no way like humans. But let him come forward and show us someone fitting this description, lest we should seem to be making a baseless[201]

[199] Homer, *Il.* 6.236; cited by Cyril at *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.424a); cf. Plato, *Smp.* 219a1; Aristotle, *EN* 5.9, 1136b10; Clement, *Prot.* 11.115.1; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carm.* 1.2.2.127.

[200] Cf *c. Gal.* fr. 24.18–29 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33.18–29).

[201] We have followed the manuscripts' εἰκαίαν ("empty" or "baseless"), rather than Boulnois' emendation (SC 582, 408–9 n. 3, adopted also by the GCS) of δικαίαν ("just"); cf. *c. Iul.* 4.18.29.

criticism of him for saying the Craftsman was careless towards "*our physical make-up*." But he cannot – how could he? – he is instead mistaken, as I said, and arguably puts natures also in the same [category] as customs and laws.

4.37 Furthermore, it was sufficiently clear from our argument in the previous discussion[202] that God has given Moses, the law, and indeed also the prophets to the herds of nations. For it was shown that not only Abraham's children but, in fact, also the inspired Abraham himself, although he was a foreigner from the land of the Chaldeans, has been called by God to a "knowledge of truth."[203] And indeed, God, through the mediation of Moses, saved those who in Egypt were subject to the worship of idols and guided them by the law to a correct and irreproachable disposition. As a result, according to the precise interpretation of the matter, it would be reasonable to consider Abraham and his descendants after him as having been a "firstfruits" of the calling of the nations.[204] The prophet Jonah was also sent to give proclamation to those in Nineveh, and it was not of his own accord, but he was dispatched after God ordered his departure. For he has power over the universe since he is also [316] the generator and Lord of all.

4.38 But Julian supposes that God's authority is restricted and is scarcely able to extend as far as the borders of the land of the Judeans; that he received the charge of ruling over only those who were descended from Israel, arguably like some kind of allotment; and indeed that he also differed little from the other ethnarchs, as he, at every turn, keeps calling gods and daemons. For again he said,

Julian

> *But see if God didn't ever give us [teachers and lawgivers][205] too, whom you know nothing about, along with gods as good protectors who are not inferior to the one honored since the beginning by the Hebrews in Judea, the only land over which he was assigned to exercise providence, as was said by Moses and those after him up to our own time.*[206]
>
> *Now if the one honored by the Hebrews was the proximate Craftsman of the world,*[207] *we ourselves have a superior conception of him, he gave us greater* [317] *goods than them – both psychological and external goods about which I will*

[202] See *c. Iul.* 3.49–53. [203] 1 Tim 2:4. [204] See Rom 11:16.
[205] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 24.27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33.27–28).
[206] Julian here takes up an issue raised in Origen, *Cels.* 5.41; see Boulnois, 2011b, 809.
[207] On this title, see *c. Iul.* 3.33.6–7 with note.

say more a little later[208] *– and he also sent to us legislators who were in no way inferior to Moses, if not many that were in fact far greater than him.*[209]

Cyril

Since, therefore, he has attempted to use the writings of Moses and those holy prophets who came after him to prove that God used to rule Judea alone, come now, yes come, and let us rein in our argument in a necessary and most useful manner and show that he is lying. For Moses did in fact proclaim one true God by nature, who is supreme, transcending all beings and surpassing every created thing; and he claims that he constructed this universe through the Son in the Spirit,[210] as we have already made clear with a lengthy discussion.[211]

But the one who is supreme, transcending all beings and surpassing every created thing, who holds the glory of lordship over all things as an essential attribute, this one our noble man places among the number of the daemons when he claims, "*see if God didn't ever give us [teachers and lawgivers] too, whom you know nothing about, along with gods as good*
[318] *protectors who are not inferior to the one honored by the Hebrews in Judea*." Tell me, are you saying gods and "*good protectors*" have been given both to you and to those who think like you? What kind of gods or protectors preside over some of the nations, such as those dwelling in the Tauric Chersonese, and then the Scythians, and the most inhuman of barbarians among whom nothing cultivated and gentle counts for anything, but who highly esteem a hot temper, have no self-control when it comes to unholy behavior, and even glorify murder? And what sort of gods or protectors "*govern*" the Persians, among whom incest is held in high regard and eagerly pursued?

"Yes," he says, "but the Greeks and Romans are nevertheless administered by good laws that are appropriate for humans and have the best gods and daemons presiding over them." If this is the case, Your Excellency, how then is it not better and doubtless also wise to establish for all people good guides who are noble, gentle, and beneficent? For God's good name is at stake! And if he is indeed good, how can you not say that he must appear as the distributor of every good thing for those who live under his rule?

[208] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 29–46 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.2–6.22).
[209] *c. Gal.* fr. 25 Mas.; Wright 1923, 354–55. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 39 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.1.24–30).
[210] On this Trinitarian formula, see the note at *c. Iul.* 3.34.21.
[211] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.28–33; 3.34–35.

4.39 "Nevertheless," Julian says, "if, on the one hand, *the one honored by the Hebrews* is like one of the others, with a delimited realm of authority, we ourselves have been allotted the better [gods]; but if, on the [319]
contrary, he *is the proximate Craftsman of the world, we ourselves have a superior conception of him*."[212] He therefore demotes "*the proximate Craftsman of the world*" as though to a secondary rank and nature in comparison to the first.[213] For having set the Good above the Craftsman, they say that it is unwavering and, ensuring that it has no concern at all over our affairs, they conceive of a second God whom they also call "*proximate*" to creation. Yet, he says, "if he *is* [the proximate Craftsman], *we ourselves have a superior conception of him*"![214]

I shall, for the time being, forego arguing with him over the finer points.[215] But Julian should at least explain how their conceptions are superior when they have allotted rule over the nations to innumerable other gods. And yet, how is it not better for him to rule over all and be honored with acclamations from all? And how can he welcome the idea that the nations were taught by others – and not even in accordance with what pleases him, if, that is, he is good – and that they go through life in such a way that – again, if he holds the good in high regard – he would be provoked to anger, since no one has given any attention to what his will is? Now as for the legislators, sages, and teachers among the Greeks, at the right time we will show that those among us are incomparably better.[216] [320]

4.40 Persisting with his own inventions and hiring himself out, so to speak, as an advocate for falsehood, he again said,

Julian

> *So then, to get back to what we were saying: if it is not the case that for each nation some god,*[217] *governing as an ethnarch – and under him an angel, a daemon, and a separate race of souls, ministering to and assisting the higher*

[212] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 25.9–11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.38.13–15).

[213] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.48.1–10; 3.34.12–16, where Plato is described as positing "another god" above the "Craftsman proximate to the world," as well as a third cause "lesser than the first ones in rank and nature."

[214] Although Julian in *c. Gal.* fr. 25 Mas. (partly quoted here) did not explicitly invoke the Neoplatonic distinction between the One (or the Good) and the Craftsman (at either the level of Mind or Soul), Cyril reacts as if he did and offers a similar critique to that offered in book 3: such a hierarchy subordinates, lessens, and unduly separates the identity of the Craftsman from the supreme deity in a way that is unacceptable to a Nicene Christian conception of the Godhead.

[215] Cyril thus signals that he will return to the topic of the Neoplatonic triad, as indeed he does at *c. Iul.* 8.21–34; but see already 4.44.

[216] Cf. *c. Iul.* 5–7, passim.

[217] We follow Neumann and Masaracchia in deleting a verb of being here.

ones[218] *– established this differentiation in laws and customs, then let it be*
[321] *shown how this came about from someone else. For it is insufficient to say "God said … and it came into existence."*[219] *For the natures of created things ought to correspond to God's commands.*

Let me put what I mean more clearly. God ordered fire to ascend, let's say, and earth to sink down: in order for the command of God to come to pass, was it not necessary that the one be light and the other be heavy?[220] *And the same reasoning would apply in other areas also.*

And after other things:

The same is true also in the case of divine things. The cause of this is that the human race is perishable and corruptible. It is, therefore, reasonable that its works are also corruptible, changeable, and undergo all sorts of transformation. But, in contrast, because God is eternal, it is fitting that his ordinances also be such. And since they are such, they either are the natures of things that exist or correspond to the nature of things that exist. For how could nature fight against God's ordinance? And how could it fall out of correspondence [to it]?

Therefore, it was not at random that God commanded that, just as the languages of the nations should be confused and disagree with one another, so too should their political constitutions.[221] *It was not by a mere command that he did these things; rather he also established that we should have natures that produce these differences. For it was necessary that first there should be different natures underlying those traits among the nations that were going to*
[322] *be different. At any rate, this is also seen in bodies, if one were to observe how much Germans and Scythians differ from Libyans and Ethiopians.*[222] *Is this*

[218] Variations of this divine hierarchy are frequent (though the inclusion of angels is less so) in both Christian and non-Christian philosophical literature of the century preceding Julian's writing, but the phrase "separate race of souls" seems unique to him. Cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Gig.* 16 (souls, daemons, angels belong to the same substrate); Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 7.68 (supreme God, angels, other daemons, heroes); Dionysius of Alexandria, *De nat.* fr. 2 (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 14.25.3; gods, daemons, souls); Plotinus 5.8.10.3 (gods, daemons, souls); Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 21.19 Sodano (physical, psychical, daemonic, angelic powers); *Ep. Aneb.* fr. 1.1b (= fr. 3 Saffrey and Segonds = Iamblichus, *Myst.* 1.3, pp.8.14–9.1; gods, daemons, heroes, pure souls); fr. 1.3e (= fr. 28a Saffrey and Segonds = Iamblichus, *Myst.* 2.3, p.70.8–9; god, angel, archangel, daemon, a certain archon, soul); fr. 2.7 Sodano (= fr. 62 Saffrey and Segonds = Cyril, *c. Iul.* 4.14.7–9; gods, daemons, souls of the dead); Iamblichus, *Myst.* 3.31, p.175.14–15 (gods, daemons, souls of the dead); Salustius, *De diis* 13.4–5 (the first God, gods, angels, daemons). In Julian's own corpus, see *in reg. Sol.* 145c (Sun, angels, daemons, heroes, individual souls).

[219] Cf., e.g., Gen 1:3, 6, 9. The sort of complaint registered here by Julian had already been aired by earlier non-Christians; see Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 5.14; Galen, *UP* 11.14; cf. also Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.2–4 (cited by Boulnois, SC 582, 93 n. 2).

[220] On the topic of the lightness and heaviness of the elements, see Aristotle, *Cael.* 4.1–3, 307b–311a.

[221] Gk.: τὰ πολιτικά.

[222] For the environment's impact on bodily differences in an author known by Julian (a point otherwise widely discussed in antiquity), see Porphyry, *Antr.* 28, which explicitly mentions the Scythians, as here.

too, then, just a mere command? And do the climate and the region, by virtue of being in a certain position relative to the heavenly bodies, contribute nothing to this?[223]

Cyril

4.41. Now I think I have said quite enough about the cause "*of the difference of customs and laws*," which separate the nations from one another such that there is variation; for we have attributed the fact that some are accustomed to live in this way and others in that way to the inclinations of their free choices[224] and the guidance of their forefathers. Yet that man who is renowned on the stage and has written tragedies on the sufferings of many – I mean Sophocles – will assist us on this point; for he has written in the following manner:

> Every city belongs to those who lead,
> And every army; but those of mortals who are disordered
> Become evil because of the words of their teachers.[225]

Do you hear that disorder is self-chosen and comes from teachers,[226] and it does not happen to anyone because of a natural necessity? [323]

But if in fact, as he says, the nations' allotment to ethnarch gods and governing daemons caused the differences in their laws and customs, let him explain again – for I shall ask him – whether the "*city-guarding*" daemons assented unwillingly to the customs and laws of humans, while having themselves a different frame of mind, or if those under their rule, since they were overcome by their superiors and forced to submit to them, were misled to go through life in accordance with what pleased them, instead of proceeding to do what each of them thinks is honorable according to the inclinations[227] of their own wills.

If, then, the gods adapted themselves to the customs and laws of humans and this situation was contrary to their will, then they are the ones who have been taught instead of doing the advising themselves, and so are proven by the actual facts to have yoked their neck to their subordinates. If this is the case, why was God making the nations subject to those who were ignorant or incapable of conveying them to a way of life

[223] *c. Gal.* fr. 26 Mas.; Wright 1923, 354–57. [224] Gk.: ταῖς … τῶν προαιρέσεων ῥοπαῖς.
[225] Sophocles, *Ph.* 386–88. These lines of Sophocles are quoted by no other ancient author, Christian or pagan.
[226] On the importance of teachers as foundational for the moral, intellectual, and spiritual malaise of the Greeks, cf. (e.g.) Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 1.2; 2.1; 3.1; 4.2; 5.1; 8.1.
[227] Gk.: ῥοπαῖς.

in keeping with their judgment? Julian ought to teach us what benefit this would bring.

But if, on the contrary, the subordinate portion follows the laws "*of the ethnarchs*," it would be reasonable for us to assign to the latter "*the causes*" of such a great and dissimilar "*difference*" in the quality of the
[324] character "*and laws*" of "*the nations*." Among the "*city-guarding or ethnarch gods*" and daemons there would, therefore, be some who are harsh, cruel, quick-tempered, and murderous, and who have chosen to love the worst of all the vices. For we would have to view the presiders over the nations as having the same characteristics that are apparent in the nations subordinated to them. In that case, isn't it clearly blaspheming God to say that he surrendered everyone on earth to beings who are so utterly loathsome and know only how to convey them to each and every inappropriate thing?

4.42 And there is something even more unbearable than this: Julian says it was necessary that "*there should be different natures underlying those traits* that were going to be dissimilar" in order that matters might correspond to God's decrees. So then, is it the case that, just as it was necessary for fire "*to be light*" by nature in order that it might obtain the ability "*to ascend*" but necessary for earth to be heavy in order that it might possess the property of lying "*down*" and staying there always,[228] in the same way some members of the human race also had to possess an evil nature and be made in this condition by the Craftsman, due to the requirement that they be carried along by the wishes of their ethnarchs? What sort of defense will be sufficient to come to his aid when he is called to account by someone with common sense? How will he
[325] release the Craftsman of the universe from inevitable and entirely understandable mockery if he is in fact the creator of defective natures? For, if Julian claims it was against his own will that he was brought to do this, he is arguably inferior to some other being set over him who surpasses him and can compel him to do something, in which case there is something greater than him. If, on the contrary, Julian contends that it was hardly against his own will that this happened, but that it was as a free agent that he came to do this, how then can he be good and from the Good?

For it is in such terms as this that Plotinus speaks about him, not presenting it as his own opinion but rather as an interpretation of Plato's view:

[228] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 26.9–11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.40.11–13).

> [Plato] says the Good, beyond intellect and beyond substance, is father of the cause that is Intellect.[229] And he often calls being and Intellect the "idea"; consequently, Plato knew that the Intellect is from the Good and Soul is from the Intellect. And he bears witness that these words are not new or recent, but were spoken long ago, although not explicitly, while our present words have brought out their full meaning.[230]

If, then, [Julian] says the Good is father to the Craftsman and the latter has created natures that are not good, the blame rises up to the Good itself, thanks, that is, to the mediation of the Craftsman who is "*proximate to the world*"; for they think it a good idea to speak in these terms.

Furthermore, I am amazed that he takes the colors of bodies as proof that one must assume there are different natures underlying the nations.[231] But, if he imagines that in making this claim he is thinking or saying something true, he fails to notice that he is in error; for surely he [326]
would be forced to conclude that all who are of the same color would, it seems, think in the same way as each other and agree in their thoughts! And if there should be someone with white skin who also happens to be good, then apparently among those without white skin there would be no one good. But if, on the contrary, there should in fact be someone black or with a dark complexion who is good, then similarly among those with white bodies there would be no one good. Aren't these ideas immediately laughable? Hasn't he spoken pointless nonsense and doesn't he vomit forth words filled with the greatest vulgarity? How could anyone argue otherwise?

4.43 But Julian brazenly insults the doctrines of piety and slanders the priestly Moses, and, supposing that Moses held the same ideas as himself, he has fallen into error, and is lying and misrepresenting the truth. For he spoke again as follows:

[229] Cf. Plato, *Ep.* 2.312e1–4, which was quoted within a quotation of Porphyry at *c. Iul.* 1.47.19–21 and paraphrased at 2.29.17–18.

[230] Plotinus 5.1.8.6–13; also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.17.10.

[231] Since Julian does not quite make these exact claims in the extant fragments of *c. Gal.*, Cyril is either alluding to material not quoted (and, as Boulnois, SC 582, 428 n. 1 notes, at *c. Iul.* 4.40.15 Cyril had explicitly alerted the reader that he omitted some material in the middle of our fr. 26) or is embellishing upon Julian's reference to somatic (though not explicitly color) differences at fr. 26.24–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.40.28–31). In light of Cyril's comments here, Neumann inserted the conjectural emendation πρὸς τὸ χρῶμα θεοῖς at *c. Iul.* 4.40.31 to add a reference to skin color into *c. Gal.* fr. 26 Mas., though the GCS edition does not adopt his proposal.

Julian

[It is clear][232] that Moses also knowingly used to conceal this sort of thing; nor has he attributed the confusion of languages to God alone. For he says that he did not come down alone, nor that just one being descended with him, but that many did so.[233] And he does not say who these ones were; but it is clear
[327] *that he assumed that those descending with him were like him.*

If, therefore, the Lord doesn't come down alone to confuse the languages but those with him also come down, it is clear that, with respect to the confusion of customs too, not only the Lord, but also those who with him were confusing the languages, would reasonably be assumed to be the cause for this discord.[234]

Cyril

He has therefore clearly admitted that Moses did not choose to go so far as saying that certain beings came down together with God at the confusion of languages, but that he only said this: "Come, let us go down and confuse their tongues."[235] So how does Julian himself divine[236] the meaning as he pleases and claim that those who came down were gods "*like*" the one who is God by nature, with a glory equal to him? Yet, the inspired Moses, quite clearly and not once but often, condemned those falsely named gods and said that you must worship one God only. For he says, "You shall worship the Lord your God and shall serve him alone."[237] And again: "The one who sacrifices to other gods aside from the Lord alone shall be utterly destroyed."[238] And he said also in the person of
[328] God: "There shall be no other gods for you but me."[239] How then could

[232] We follow the GCS edition in positing the omission of some words here and have offered the present conjecture; for alternatives to this line, see the GCS apparatus.

[233] Cf. Gen 11:7, where the divine speaks in the plural; Cyril provides the quotation of this verse in his response.

[234] *c. Gal.* fr. 27 Mas.; Wright 1923, 356–59.

[235] Gen 11:7.

[236] Gk.: μαντεύεται. Cyril could be using this term for Julian's interpretive activity here as a slight on Julian's well-known interest in and practice of divination (see Kaldellis 2005 for discussion of divination in Julian's transition to sole emperor; cf. Athanassiadi 1992, 87). Although Cyril nowhere shows clear evidence of knowing Iamblichus' *De mysteriis*, that treatise by the philosopher most admired by Julian contains a lengthy discussion of modes of divination and the ways of determining what sort of being manifests itself during the various modes of divination (see especially the entire third book of the *Myst.*; for context, see Athanassiadi 1993; for Iamblichus' importance to Julian, see Bouffartigue 1992, 331–59; Smith 1995, 104–12; Elm 2012, 125 n. 124, 293–97). Divination is also a major topic of discussion at *c. Iul.* 10.17–21 (responding to *c. Gal.* fr. 82 Mas.) and *c. Iul.* 10.37–42 (responding to *c. Gal.* frs. 87–88 Mas.). Indeed, book 10 concludes with Cyril reporting that Julian claimed (presumably in a part of *c. Gal.* that has not been preserved) that he divined his rise to the imperial throne by the use of birds.

[237] Matt 4:10 = Luke 4:8; cf. Deut 6:13 = 10:20. [238] Exod 22:19(20). [239] Exod 20:3 = Deut 5:7.

Moses "*know*" that other gods "*descended*"[240] and cooperated with the one and only true God by nature?[241]

4.44 He will, nevertheless, next respond by asking, "How could Moses say 'Come' and 'Let us go down' [in the plural] if he were referring to one subject?" Moses was not unaware that God is one or that one nature of divinity is worshipped in a holy and consubstantial Trinity, I mean in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.[242] For even if each of those named is believed to be precisely what it is by virtue of being distinct persons and *hypostases* – for the Father is a father, the Son is a son, the Spirit is a spirit – nevertheless, the identity of their substance brings them together into a unity.[243]

Furthermore, our argument has shown already that even his own teachers, who are so admired by him for obtaining a reputation of supposed wisdom, also expanded the inviolate divine nature "as far as three *hypostases*."[244] But there is no harm in recalling it briefly. Plato, for example, says the highest God is the Good, while the Intellect shone forth [329]
from him and is the "*proximate Craftsman of the world*"[245] since the First remains immoveable,[246] and he introduces Soul in third place, by which he claims all things are moved and ensouled. That is what Plato says.

As for ourselves, however, when we compose an account about the highest divinity that is sound and has been honed to a true point,[247] we say that the Son has been begotten from God the Father, being in every respect invariably equal to him in nature, and that the Holy Spirit too proceeded, in whom he gives all things life. The life-giving Holy Spirit, therefore, proceeds ineffably, as I said, from the Father, while being conferred upon the creation through the Son. [330]

Moses, therefore, knew the one venerable nature of divinity that is in the holy Trinity. For this very reason, he sometimes uses the singular and

[240] Cyril alludes inexactly to *c. Gal.* fr. 27.4, 6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.43.6, 8).

[241] *c. Iul.* 4.43.17–31 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 856–58.

[242] *c. Iul.* 4.44.1–4 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 858.

[243] Cyril's trinitarian interpretation of the biblical use of the plural here contrasts with many Christians who interpreted it as designating God's speaking to angels, e.g., Didymus, *Gen.* 3:22 (SC 233.258); Augustine, *C. D.* 16.5; for discussion, see Boulnois, SC 582, 580–82.

[244] See Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith, cited above at *c. Iul.* 1.47.5–9 and again at *c. Iul.* 8.27.9–18.

[245] Interestingly, Cyril here applies Julian's language of the "proximate Craftsman" to Plato's thought; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 18.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.6–7) with the note there.

[246] Cyril repeats here the language he had used at *c. Iul.* 3.35.8 when introducing a quotation mistakenly attributed to Plato, but in fact from Numenius (fr. 15), which Cyril knew from one of his sources, Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.18.20–21; see Boulnois SC 582, 433 nn. 3–4; Meijering 1975, 117–18. Similar to Numenius is Plotinus 5.1.6.15–27 (especially 25: ἀκινήτου ὄντος), an essay quoted, but possibly not known in its entirety, by Cyril (see *c. Iul.* 8.30.3–12; 8.31.7–11).

[247] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένον εἰς ἀλήθειαν. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.

at other times also the plural, such as "Let us make humanity according to our image and according to our likeness."[248] For God was not actually making certain other beings his helpers in order to create humanity; instead, the phrases "Let us make" and "according to our image" were an indication of the holy and consubstantial Trinity. Accordingly, the present passage, "Come, let us go down and confuse their tongues," does not indicate that other gods were taken as his assistants – for how or in what way could he do this since they do not exist at all? Rather, it hints at the venerable, great, and remarkable mystery of the holy Trinity.[249]

4.45 Moreover, this too is something worthy of amazement: although Julian is wise, at least according to his own perspective and his smug self-understanding, he is not ashamed to ascribe to the virtue-loving God the perversion of human customs and to say that he, along with the others, is an accessory to such shameful and unholy deeds. In fact, the confusion of tongues contains a perfectly reasonable explanation of the cause of this occurrence. For the Craftsman of the universe was wanting to hinder those at that time who were pointlessly toiling away at the tower's construction; and indeed, he also succeeded in hindering them by dividing them into a diversity of languages. Nevertheless, this act did not
[331] harm those who experienced it to the point of going from good to bad and passing from excellent customs to more shameful ones. In fact, in every person there exists the potential to attain a good reputation and to go through life in a magnificent manner,[250] even if he should speak a different language that does not sound like the language of the Greeks.

Moreover, how could the perversion of customs not prove detrimental to those on earth if the customs of barbarians are loathsome, namely their cruelty and unrestrained wrath, their inability to control their desires, their tolerance of murder, and all of their other customs that our laws censure? How, then, could it be the case that God, who is such a lover of good, brought about the perversion of what was upright?

4.46 Summing up his whole argument, he again says the following:

Julian

> *Well then, why have I given such a detailed account of these topics when my intention was <not> to speak at length? This is why: if the God proclaimed by Moses is the proximate Craftsman of the world,*[251] *better views about him can*

[248] Gen 1:26. [249] *c. Iul.* 4.44.25–35 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 858.
[250] This sentence is cited in a version of the *Sacra* attributed to Leontius and John (cf. PG 86.2060c).
[251] Cf. Julian, *Ep.* 89a (pp.154.14–155.8 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 20 [pp.60–61 Wright]).

be found among us[252] *who take him to be the common master of all, while taking the others as ethnarchs who happen to be under him like viceroys of a king,*[253] *with each one variously directing its own department; and we do not position*[254] *him as a particular god rivalling*[255] *the gods positioned under him.*[256] [332]

But if, on the contrary, Moses honored a particular god and attributed to him a universal rule, then it would be better for them to be persuaded by us and recognize the God of the universe, while also not ignoring [the particular Jewish god], than to honor the one who has been allotted control of the tiniest portion in place of the Craftsman of all things.[257]

Cyril

Now it is true that the one who has been proclaimed by the all-wise Moses is "*the Craftsman of all things*" and he is the master of the universe [333] both visible and invisible, and there is nothing that exists which does not submit its neck to his rule.

Nevertheless, Julian once more divvies up his kingdom to apostate and unclean daemons and yet says that his conception of him is superior to ours! What's more, coming up with ingenious explanations, he adds that if the one worshipped by us is a "*particular*" god, it would be better "*not to ignore*" the one universal God. But, in fact, we do *not* ignore the one God who is over all beings, as we have shown in a lengthy argument. So those who share Julian's error should listen also to our response: "'Listen, you who are deaf, and look up to see, you who are blind';[258] abandon such disgusting and ridiculous worship. Get rid of the '*particular*,' falsely

[252] For Julian's generally positive view of the God of the Jews, see *c. Gal.* frs. 71; 72; 74; 75 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.9–17; 9.22.5–24; 9.32.4–19; 9.39.5–33); Finkelstein 2018; Ritter 2020, 16–18. Porphyry similarly located the Jewish god among the Neoplatonic triadic hypostases. Cf. *De Chald. Orac.* fr. 365 Smith, on which see Johnson 2013, 267, 274. Julian, in contrast, seems more uncertain of his position in the divine hierarchy.

[253] The term ὕπαρχος ("viceroy") was equivalent to *praefectus* in the imperial era; see Mason 1974, 95. Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 8.35; the application of the bureaucratic metaphor goes back to Ps-Aristotle, *Mu.* 6.398a18–19.

[254] Julian gently plays here with the absurdity of mere humans presuming to "position" or "set up" the place of the Craftsman when even the other gods are "positioned" under him (καθίσταμεν … `τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεῶν καθισταμένων).

[255] Gk.: ἀντιμερίτην; this rare compound (which may be a neologism of Julian's) plays off of Julian's theology of a "particular god" placed over a "part" of the earth (as in the next sentence, μερικόν τινα … τὸν τοῦ ἐλαχίστου μέρους εἰληχότα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν).

[256] Earlier in this book at *c. Iul.* 4.8–9, Cyril argued that Julian's view in fact leads to precisely the notion that he here rejects, namely that the ethnarch gods, understood as daemons, are indeed political rivals to the one true God.

[257] *c. Gal.* fr. 28 Mas.; Wright 1923, 358–59. [258] Isa 42:18.

named gods, who are not in fact gods at all, and with us worship the one true God by nature."

4.47 Moreover, those who want to do so can easily understand from the God-breathed scripture that Julian is lying when he says the God of the universe divvied up his own kingdom to certain other gods and "*viceroys*" and "*ethnarchs*." For I will now attempt to show that this state of
[334] affairs was contrary to his will.

So then, Israel once made a calf in the desert, disregarding their own salvation. God was angered at this and said to the hierophant Moses: "Go, rise up from here, you and your people whom you brought out of the land of Egypt to the land that I swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, saying: 'I shall give it to your seed. And I shall send along my angel before your face […]; I shall not go up with you because you are a stiff-necked people […].' And the people," it says, "upon hearing this dreadful statement mourned in clothes of mourning […]. And Moses said to him: 'Unless you yourself go along, do not lead me up from here; how else will it truly be known that I have found favor with you, both I and your people, unless you go along with us? […].' And the Lord said to Moses: 'Even this request of yours, which you have spoken, I will do.'"[259]

Observe, then, surely observe that Israel conducted themselves under God's guidance and enjoyed this condition as a fruit of the greatest prosperity, but when they had committed no small offense by inclining
[335] towards apostasy, they took on the condition of being under an angel's guidance as a form of punishment. And I might point out that it was also a holy angel that God was promising would preside over them; still it was incomparably better to be under the Lord of the universe himself instead of being yoked to certain other beings besides him – a fate, indeed, that Israel avoided because the all-wise Moses entreated God on their behalf. But if, in fact, Israel's being under an angel was something essential and beneficial, Moses would not have begged God to prevent it, nor would the God of the universe himself have assented to him if Moses was begging to prevent something good. And when he desisted from his anger, saying that he would in his own person be present with Israel despite the fact that they had sinned, it should certainly be clear that it was not something contrary to God's will or undignified for him to rule those on the earth, not through some mediator but closely[260] and in a

[259] Exod 33:1–2, 3, 4, 15–17.

[260] Gk.: προσεχῶς; by adopting this adverb, Cyril may be playing off of Julian's notion of the "proximate Craftsman."

hands-on way,[261] so to speak. And, it should likewise be clear that it was not without detriment for humans to be placed under the rule of other beings, whether "*ethnarchs*" or angels, even if some of them should be good, holy, and subordinate to the God over all beings.

4.48 I should, moreover, add something else that will not fail to contribute to my readers' benefit. For it is true that wicked apostate daemons divided up those on earth among themselves, but the only-begotten Word of God, the Father's omnipotent right hand, the hand [336] that rules over all, became human to release the captives from the daemons' greed and bring them to God the Father. This will be confirmed by that priest of Christ's mysteries, the all-wise Paul, who writes: "For just as all die in Adam, so also in Christ all will be made alive. But each in his proper order: Christ the firstfruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ, then comes the end when[262] he will hand over the kingdom to God the Father, once he has abolished all rule and all authority and power."[263]

You hear that, when all "authority and power" have been abolished and the devil's greed is entirely destroyed, the Son "hands over the kingdom to God the Father," as if he had taken away from a tyrant what he had plundered and were bringing it to the one who begot him. For it is not the case that he hands over the kingdom to the Father by removing himself from ruling over it; rather, he hands it over because it is now free, as I said, since the enemies have been scared off and no one else is left to [337] rule over those on earth except him and him alone through the Son with the Holy Spirit.

How, then, could it not be the case that the subjection of those on earth to certain "*ethnarchs*" or "*city-guarding gods*" was something contrary to the will of him who has in fact even become human like us and "endured the cross, despising its shame,"[264] in order to expel the mass of unholy daemons from their tyranny over us?

[261] Gk.: αὐτουργικῶς; cf. *c. Iul.* 2.38.3–6, where Cyril criticizes the view that God would deprive his creation of his direct involvement (αὐτουργίας).

[262] This segment of text (*c. Iul.* 4.48.11–18) was included in abbreviated form in the catena tradition. Cf. Cramer 1844, v: 302.3–6.

[263] 1 Cor 15:22–24. [264] Heb 12:2.

Book 5

[338] **5.1** The blessed David reveals that the inability to control one's tongue is the most shameful of diseases. For example, he even used to offer prayers about it, saying: "Place a guard on my mouth, O Lord, and a gate of constraint about my lips. Do not turn my heart away to words of wickedness."[1] In fact, I would say that it is priceless to make the wise choice of keeping one's mind focused upon the thoughts that are appropriate for truly sensible people and, indeed, to use irreproachable speech in this endeavor. For it has been written that, "If a person does not stumble in his speech, he is a perfect man, capable of reining in the rest of his body too."[2] On the other hand, how could anyone not find fault, and quite understandably so, with someone using a carefree and relaxed
[339] tongue that has free rein to proceed to each and every reprehensible thing?

And someone will, I suppose, say that those caught in such fearful illnesses have exceeded the bounds of every vice. Come, therefore, let us show that one such person is Julian, the lover of slander and accusation, who readily gallops down every path of abuse against us and who has drilled himself in disparaging speech like no other critic of the Christians' worship who came before him.[3] For, in addition to what he has dared to speak thus far, he also vilifies the law that came through the all-wise Moses and has made such an outcry against the sacred utterances that, if someone could be indicted for ignorance, it would be just to call him to account on precisely these grounds.

5.2 He writes as follows:

[1] Ps 140(141):3–4. [2] Jas 3:2.

[3] This comment may hint at Cyril's awareness of earlier critics of Christianity such as Celsus and Porphyry. Earlier at *c. Iul.* 1.38.1–2 (and again, at 5.21.20–21) Cyril mentions in passing that Porphyry had written against Christianity, though it is not clear whether he was actually familiar with Porphyry's *Chr.* (see our note at 1.38.1–2).

Julian

Moses' law is marvelous, namely that Decalogue, "You shall not steal. You shall not murder. You shall not bear false witness […]."[4] *Let us write each of the commandments using the exact words, which he claims were written by God himself: "I am the Lord your God who led you up from the land of Egypt […]." Second after this:*[5] *"You shall have no other gods but me. You shall not make for yourself an idol […]," and he adds the reason for this: "For I am the Lord your God, a jealous God repaying the sins of the fathers upon the children up to the third […] generation […]." "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain […]. Remember the day of the Sabbath […]. […] Honor your father and mother […]. You shall not commit adultery. You shall not murder. You shall not steal.*[6] *You shall not bear false witness […]. You shall not desire your neighbor's things."*[7] [340]

By the gods, what sort of nation is there that, aside from "You shall not worship other gods"[8] *and "Remember the day of the Sabbath," does not think it obligatory to keep the other commandments, so as also to lay down punishments for those who transgress them, sometimes harsher, sometimes similar to the punishments legislated by Moses, and sometimes even more humane than his?*[9] [341]

Cyril

He seems to me to have forgotten the objection he has often made,[10] in which he strived to show that some nations are steered by good and most civilized laws, while others have an allotment that is more savage, such that they are carried by unchecked impulses towards each and every vice. For he said that each of the "*ethnarchs*" or "*city-guarding*" daemons administers the realm allotted to them as they see fit and, for those under

[4] Exod 20:14–16.

[5] It may be significant that Julian considers the preceding sentence to be the first commandment, whereas Christian and Hellenized Jewish authors considered it to be something of a prologue, so that what follows would be the "first" commandment; at the same time, like Julian, the Jerusalem Talmud (*Berakoth* 3c) considers the prologue to be the first commandment and what follows as the second (see Boulnois, SC 582, 450–51 n. 3). Of course, this leaves us with eleven commandments in this paragraph, unless having no gods and making no idols are combined.

[6] Julian here follows the order of Deut 5:17–19 (quoted at Rom 13:9), rather than that of Exod 20:13–15.

[7] Julian quotes selectively from Exod 20:2–17.

[8] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 72.15–21 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.22.17–23), where Julian claims that Jews and Greeks agree in all areas except in the former's requirement of monolatry.

[9] *c. Gal.* fr. 29 Mas.; Wright 1923, 358–61. On the general similarity of the law and the morality of the philosophers, cf. Celsus at Origen, *Cels.* 1.4; for Julian's possible dependence upon the *Cels.*, see Boulnois 2014, especially 122.

[10] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21 and 22 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2 and 4.24).

them, they issue laws that are in keeping with their own judgment.[11] How, then, can he here speak of every nation or say there are no people
[342] who want to disregard the duty of living in a correct and lawful manner?

I am, therefore, unable to explain what convinced him to consider so venerable and admirable a law as worthy of the worst possible slanders, since the law is manifestly concerned about two things that are more important than anything else[12] and, after putting them before the other divine decrees, it uses them to set the tune for the other ones also, which enable one to attain the most excellent life of all, and quite rightly so. For I hold that the greatest of all the divine decrees is piety towards God, and that it is brought to completion through our desire to be attached to him and our rejection of the habits that go along with apostasy,[13] and by our refusal to assign to anyone else the honors properly due to him and him alone. For "I am the Lord your God,"[14] it says, and, "You shall have no other gods but me."[15] Given, then, that even in our own affairs falsehood is detestable to all decent people, while going straight towards the truth has nearly always been cherished, wouldn't it be worthwhile to choose to recognize the one who truly exists, with a knowledge that is precise and
[343] finely calibrated to the truth, and not go off in another direction after what is inappropriate, attaching worship to certain falsely named beings who are not gods?

5.3 Hence, after first showing that there is one true God by nature, Moses has ordered that they be people who show respect towards parents, offering rewards worth attaining to those wishing to win renown in this regard.[16] For he says, "Honor your father and your mother, in order that

[11] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 26.2–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.40.4–7 with note) on the difference of laws being the result of "some god, governing as an ethnarch – and under him an angel, a daemon, and a separate race of souls, ministering and assisting the higher ones." The language of gods as ethnarchs also appears in *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12; 4.46.7–8).

[12] Namely, "I am the Lord your God …, " and "You shall have no other gods …, " (which makes a subtle shift from the two isolated by Julian, namely worshipping no other gods and keeping the Sabbath).

[13] Cf. Deut 4:9b.

[14] Exod 20:2 (= Deut 5:6).

[15] Exod 20:3 (= Deut 5:7). For a lengthier discussion of this point, see the entire sixth book of Cyril's *Ador.* (PG 68.408–77), which focuses on the need to be exclusively devoted to God and begins with an exegesis of Exod 20:2–6.

[16] Cyril here seemingly jumps from the first commandment to the fifth one (or the fourth by Julian's numbering) about honoring parents as though it followed directly after. Probably he assumes that commandments one through four all pertain to one's devotion to God, while the fifth commandment begins addressing issues of human relations. Hence, when he says "showing that there is one true God by nature" in this sentence he probably has in mind not just the first commandment but commandments one through four as a group. On the other hand, cf. *Ador.* 7 (PG 68.505d–513d), where Cyril connects the honor due to parents to the honor due to God as the divine parent.

it might go well with you and you might be long-lived in the land."[17] Then, after this, he prohibits every form of badness and abolishes unholy behavior. For he says, "You shall not murder, you shall not steal, you shall not commit adultery," and so on.[18] How, then, could anyone not admire the extremely wise Moses and consider the law established through him to be worthy of all amazement, unless it should be the case that those who have chosen to think like the Greeks have completely disregarded the duty of living a brilliant and holy life? [344]

Yet Julian claims that all the nations knew and "*kept*" these observances – was it because they learned them from another, with someone before the all-wise Moses also legislating such things for them? On the contrary, you would not be able to mention any legislator who was older than Moses.[19] Or was it because the nations possess a knowledge of what is beneficial implanted in their nature by the Craftsman and have obtained the capacity to distinguish what is worse from what is better? Let's assume it is so. If this is the case, then the best teachings would be those that also agree with the law of nature itself. But he claims that human nature lacks the ability to acquire on its own the knowledge of what is beneficial.[20] If so, then those scattered throughout all the earth would have needed correct instruction. So then, Moses' law would understandably be worthy of admiration.[21] For, it instills in those who are ignorant the knowledge of how to perform actions that remove them from punishment and make them worthy of rewards.

5.4 Furthermore, let Julian answer this question for me: does he consider worthy of praise those who want to live rightly and who have chosen to keep such commandments – "You shall not murder; you shall not commit adultery; you shall not desire your neighbor's things; you shall not bear false witness […];[22] you shall not commit perjury";[23] and [345]

[17] Exod 20:12 (= Deut 5:16). The paragraph up to this point is also preserved in the Luke catena (see PG 72.857b).

[18] Exod 20:15, 14, 13 (= Deut 5:18, 19, 17). [19] For Moses' antiquity, see *c. Iul.* 1.5–17.

[20] Cyril probably has in mind Julian's earlier statement that the nations receive moral instruction from their presiding deities (*c. Gal.* fr. 26.2–5 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.40.4–7]), which he is here probably contrasting with an innate moral intuition.

[21] In the opening line of *c. Gal.* fr. 29 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.2) Julian did in fact declare the Mosaic law to be "marvelous" (θαυμαστός), though the context makes clear he intended it as sarcasm. Cyril no doubt detected the sarcasm and here argues that Julian was more correct than he realized.

[22] Cyril does not follow the exact order of the Decalogue; see Exod 20:15, 13, 17, 16 (= Deut 5:18, 17, 21, 20).

[23] Cyril has allowed the words of the gospel to stand alongside the words of the Decalogue here; see Matt 5:33.

the rest – or does he consider even these people to be fair game for inevitable ridicule? Now if it is the case that he praises such people, how is it not foolish of him to make such an extremely rash denunciation of such admirable commandments? For they are keeping those things that they too recognize one should admire. But if, on the contrary, he does not approve of such people at all, and instead prosecutes them, then without doubt he would clearly be the only one who deems it right to admire what is prohibited also by the laws of the Greeks and who chooses to honor whatever is condemned by the verdict of all.[24]

For Solon and Lycurgus are said to have drafted the best laws for the Greeks. And not only is Moses older than them both but they were not even born until much later in time. Tell me, then, since the commandment given through Moses clearly declares that one ought neither to engage in murder nor indeed to lust after someone else's marriage bed, and he condemns stealing, perjury, and the act of bearing false witness, and defines punishments for those who sin, didn't these things seem correct to Julian's own legislators, or couldn't you discover them making their way with equivalent words?

If, therefore, Moses has written laws that are out of tune with Solon and Lycurgus, Julian ought to come forward and teach us that this is so; for, it is sufficient for us that those whom he holds in admiration are condemned by his own verdicts.[25] But, if, on the contrary, their laws
[346] sometimes concur with those of Moses and are held in very high esteem when they agree with the laws of the Hebrews, how does Julian not perceive that he is denouncing his own ancestors along with ours?

5.5 Nevertheless, because Moses' commandments[26] are well-known and observed by people all around the world and because there is no one who finds them unsatisfactory, for this very reason Julian says they must be maligned! Yet shouldn't the fact that they have received the honorable verdicts of everyone instead be a reason for them to be suitably admired? Or again, let him teach us which deeds are rightly to be praised instead of these: those deeds that are agreeable to everyone and for which anyone would cast their vote as exceedingly well done and correct; or those that

[24] In this paragraph Cyril implicitly concedes Julian's point that much of the Decalogue overlaps with the moral precepts honored among the Greeks but takes Julian to task for treating it so flippantly and with such derision. If he really cared about people living ethically, Cyril suggests, Julian would not have made it an object of sarcasm.

[25] i.e., if Moses' laws, which condemn murder, adultery, and so on, do not agree with those of Solon and Lycurgus, then the latter must be accepting of such immoralities and would thus be condemned by Julian's previous support of such prohibitions.

[26] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως.

are agreeable to but a few or even no one at all? But, of course, it would be those deeds that are agreeable to everyone, it seems to me. And this is the situation we have when it comes to the divine decrees given through Moses. How, then, have these observations, which should naturally bring one to marvel at these decrees, instead led him, like an imbecile, to subject them to the most extreme slander?

Now if, because it was Moses who first declared these things and, furthermore, because they are agreeable to everyone, Julian deems it right to divorce them from the praise that is their due, I would point out that someone who has chosen to think like him would reasonably have to include in his condemnation many other people as well who have obtained a not ignoble reputation. There were certain people who were the first to discover the arts and sciences pertaining to all the areas of this life of ours: some invented weaving and some bronze-working; others invented shoemaking and furthermore medicine; and a great many other necessary and beneficial things were invented as well by many people.[27] So then if these skills are pleasing to all and have been pursued out of necessity, prevailing even up to the present day, shall we [for this reason] deprive their inventors of receiving their due admiration? But doing so would, of course, be unjust. For the fact that the inventions arising from their innate skill are honored by everyone instead produces an even more robust praise for them. [347]

5.6 But this faithless and brash man not only denounces the divine decrees, but also adds something else and says,

Julian

> […][28] *but the commandment, "You shall not worship other gods,"*[29] *which he says while also slandering God, since he says God is "jealous,"*[30] *and again in another passage: "Our God is a consuming fire."*[31]
>
> *Is it, then, the case that you think a jealous and envious person deserves blame, but you deify this quality if God is said to be struck with jealousy?*[32] *Yet*

[27] Cf. Clement, *Str.* 1.16.74–77; for general discussion of the early Christian historical discourse on inventors, see Thraede 1962.

[28] Cyril seems to begin citing this passage of *c. Gal.* in mid sentence. [29] Exod 20:5 (= Deut 5:9).

[30] Exod 20:5 (= Deut 5:9).

[31] Deut 4:24, though Julian appears to cite the version of the passage as it is quoted in Heb 12:29. Cf. Julian, *Ep.* 89a (p.155.4–8 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 20 [pp.60–61 Wright]), where Julian claims that this is the one area in which the Jews err.

[32] Julian has already accused the biblical god of jealousy at *c. Gal.* fr. 17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.29). See also *c. Gal.* fr. 54.17–18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.9.23–25), where he claims that jealousy belongs neither to virtuous humans nor to angels or gods.

how is it reasonable to speak such a blatant lie against God? For if he is struck with jealousy then it is against his will that all the gods are worshipped and
[348] *that all the other nations worship their gods. Then why didn't he prevent it, since he is so jealous and does not want the other gods to be worshipped but himself alone?*[33] *Was he unable or was he from the beginning unwilling to stop the other gods from also being worshipped? But of course, the first possibility, to say that he actually was unable, is impious, while the second is in accord with our practices.*

Get rid of this nonsense and don't draw such a terrible blasphemy down upon your own selves.[34]

Cyril

So, then, he pretends to be pious towards God in order to make his attack on the God-breathed scripture seem plausible; for he says that calling God "jealous" is utterly disgraceful, quite simpleminded, and not undeserving of punishment.

In that case he should listen to our response: the divine is untouched by every passion, eternally anchored in its own goods, and possesses an
[349] unshakeable permanence in that state in which it exists. Nevertheless, when interpreting the dispositions exhibited in each of its actions, the people who speak about the divine make use of human words drawn from our experience, since otherwise they would not be able to say anything. So, it is true that jealousy and anger, as well as all the [passions] that incur equal criticism, make an impassioned assault against people's minds, since our nature was afflicted with impotence and a natural propensity for wrongdoing could overpower each person's soul without, as it were, even lifting a finger. Yet if these things are said of God as well, then, yes at that time indeed, we, for our part, quite sensibly understand them in a way appropriate to and befitting of the ineffable nature and, by keeping that nature untouched by our weaknesses, we shall in no way commit an impiety.

5.7 Hence, when God is called "jealous," you need to consider the
[350] fact that the proclivity of his subjects for going after what is rather shameful is something most abhorrent to him. For, in my view, we must have a steadfast disposition and maintain an immoveable permanence in our sincere devotion to God, since the tendency to be agitated and to plunge oneself into unlawful deeds would not be

[33] For similar criticism, see Origen, *Cels.* 8.2; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.23.3.
[34] *c. Gal.* fr. 30 Mas.; Wright 1923, 360–63.

characteristic of good men, but instead presents an intolerable insult against God's glory.[35]

For someone could say to them, "Why in fact have you dishonored the one God who exists by nature and inclined towards the others," I mean those gods who are falsely named and, in fact, are no gods at all? God says through one of the holy prophets something like this to the descendants of Israel: "What error did your fathers find in me, that they turned far away from me and went after empty things and became empty themselves?"[36] For I suppose the person running with free rein away from the one who is God by nature must first air the complaints he has with service under him so that he might have an excuse for his apostasy; but as for the person who is unable to make any accusation against God, yet still chooses to do this anyway and becomes an ardent admirer of such utterly detestable beings, how is it not just that he be punished? For by experiencing punishment, he will either improve himself or become a source of benefit to others, since they will avoid being captured in the same faults if the punishment is something they detest. [351]

5.8 Being good, therefore, the Craftsman of the universe couldn't simply permit people to wander away from him, but instead had to curb by means of fear the laxity and carelessness that lead to apostasy. It was for this reason that God was called both "jealous" and "a consuming fire" in the words of Moses. For we will readily see that dashing away from God is dangerous for those who experience it, and what's more even contributes to our destruction, if we consider the matter in the following way.

For nothing, in my view, can match the sure knowledge of God and the subtle and sharpened[37] contemplation [of him] – no abundance of wealth, no worldly brilliance, no swelling pride of offices, no appearance of "the wisdom" that is "earthly, carnal, and belongs to daemons."[38] God, at any rate, said at one point through the voice of Jeremiah: "Let not the wise man boast in his wisdom, and let not the powerful man boast in his [352] power, and let not the wealthy man boast in his wealth, but let the one who boasts boast in this, in understanding and knowing that I am the Lord."[39] And at one point the Savior himself also said to God the Father in heaven: "And this is eternal life: that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you sent."[40]

[35] We adopt Boulnois' suggestion that the preposition and the article for "glory" were transposed (Boulnois SC 582, 468–69 n. 1).

[36] Jer 2:5. [37] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένης. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.

[38] Jas 3:15 (which, incidentally, is given in the context of a rebuke for jealousy in the Christian community).

[39] Jer 9:22–23 (= Odes 3:10). [40] John 17:3.

5.9 Accordingly, knowledge of God would be the most excellent of boasts. The elite ranks of the Greeks also agree that this is correct. Alexander, that ardent admirer of Aristotle, says, for example, in his book *On Providence of Particulars*,

> Perhaps one ought to say the truth: it is through piety itself towards the divine that the greatest and most perfect good comes, as invariably does the life that is blessed.[41] And, it has been proven that this resides in contemplation; and contemplation resides in knowledge of the most excellent things; and the most excellent things are admitted by everyone to be those that are divine. Since these things are so, blessedness[42] for us would reside in knowledge of divine things.[43]

Accordingly, as I just said, nothing could be more precious to ardent admirers of the true wisdom than the doctrines about God. But what carries a person away from this goal is devoting oneself to falsely named gods and being ignorant of what it is that truly exists, and so being bereft of the pure and true view about God. In that case would it not
[353] contribute to the advantage of the inhabitants of the earth to know that this state of affairs grieves God, "who wants all people to be saved and come to a knowledge of truth?"[44] Just as we say that disabled eyesight is extremely difficult and hard for anyone to bear, and that having healthy eyes is thrice-desired and much prayed for, so being unable to see God's qualities and being deprived of the intelligible light that illumines "the eye of the heart"[45] would understandably be something horrifying that we should avoid at all costs, while the vision of God would be an object worth obtaining and one that would be effective for our salvation, the root and source of all that is good for us.

Why, tell me, wouldn't someone grant that it is better by far to choose to live lawfully under God than to conduct one's life unlawfully apart from God? Indeed, how is it not clear to everyone which option is better? Therefore, given that people who live apart from God by choosing to worship beings who are not gods are inevitably bereft of a yoke, laws, and a holy way of life, wouldn't someone praise God the Savior of the universe for keeping the inhabitants of the earth away from the cause of
[354] this condition?

[41] Gk.: εὐδαιμόνως. [42] Gk.: τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν.

[43] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De prov.* (?) fr. 7 Riedweg (= fr. 6 Grant; absent in the Arabic version). Cf. *De prov*. fr. 6 Riedweg, quoted at *c. Iul.* 3.17.4–10. On the Greek fragments of this work (found only in Cyril), see *c. Iul.* 2.38–39 with note.

[44] 1 Tim 2:4. [45] Cf. Eph 1:18.

5.10 But perhaps he has offended Julian when he subjects the unbridled person to punishments and constructs a sort of barrier to keep such pitiful people away from what would destroy them by telling them that he is jealous. On his view, we would then be entirely within our rights to prosecute those seated upon the thrones of the earthly empire if they should happen to be upset at seeing some of their personal bodyguards abandoning their allegiance towards them and choosing instead the side of the barbarians! And of course, even if one of the generals under them should see any of the enlisted soldiers not only casting down their shield, but also completely neglecting the duty of hard work, he should be completely unperturbed by this! And even if some of the livestock in the field should be carried off from the herd and become prey for the most savage of wolves, the shepherd should be nonchalant! And the farmer too should feel the same way as his garden withers away! And fathers as well should nonchalantly lie back as their dearest children slip into riotous behavior! And the master also should be unperturbed when he sees his most loyal servants neglecting allegiance to him and choosing to plot with his bitterest enemies! [355]

Yet I imagine that someone would say these ideas are clear and compelling evidence of a total lack of seriousness. In that case, how could God have no concern for his subjects who had slipped into distress? For it was necessary, yes necessary indeed, that he redirect them into the straight path by using terrifying warnings like a sort of bridle. The divine David also said this sort of thing to him: "May you constrain with a muzzle and a bridle the jaws of those who fail to draw near to you."[46]

5.11 Furthermore, Julian owes me an explanation for the following question which I would love to ask him: does he admit that those whom he supposes and claims to be gods find fault with certain people and even are irritated with them if, by coming to their senses and jettisoning their willingness to submit to such beings, they should undergo a transformation to a better condition and submit themselves to the true God, preferring instead the worship of Christians? Or does he hold they are not troubled by this? Now if such behavior is of no great concern to them, why then does he bring a groundless rebuke against those who have chosen to transfer their allegiance from the Greek error to the truth? Why doesn't he instead share the attitude of his gods? For if they are right to refuse to feel aggrieved by this, then it is he himself who has adopted the more shameful attitude or perhaps he rebukes his own gods for

[46] Ps 31(32):9.

neglecting what is proper. But if, on the contrary, Julian has adopted the correct attitude in feeling upset and aggrieved, is it not fair to say that he has received the winning verdict and appears somehow to be superior
[356] even to the wisest gods?

But, of course, this behavior does grieve them. And so, in that case too, it should be understood as a matter of jealousy. And if so,[47] is it then not completely stupid of him to cry out against Moses' writings by saying God should not be upset if some who have conducted their affairs under God's guidance should be flippant and easily swayed and, rejecting the life-giving knowledge about him, should fall into the pit of destruction?

"Nevertheless," says Julian, "why didn't God prevent them [from worshipping other gods], when it was in his power to do so?" "But Your Excellency," I would say, "isn't he keeping them away from vice by threatening wrath, suspending punishment over their heads, saying he is a 'fire,' and curtailing laxity by using fear?" "Nevertheless," says Julian, "it would have been better for him to do so by compelling and forcing them."[48] In that case, how is the activity of the human mind free and permitted to act according to its own judgment? "Virtue is" something "without any master"[49] as the elite ranks of the Greeks themselves say, in order that due praise may reasonably come to those who are good and
[357] due punishment to those who are not, since the fact that it is possible to be distinguished in good deeds means those who fall into more shameful behavior are punished as free agents.

5.12 In addition, Julian also states,

[47] The remainder of this paragraph and the following one are included in smaller type at *c. Gal.* fr. 31 Mas., apparently as a *testimonium* of the context in Julian's argument for the verbatim quotation at *c. Iul.* 5.12.3–6, which counts as a fragment proper (interestingly, Masaracchia only translates the latter segment without comment in her accompanying translation at p.260). It is, however, unclear whether Cyril is transmitting authentic material of Julian (even if not the precise wording) or merely providing an imagined response by the dead emperor to his present argument. For a brief discussion with comparanda in earlier Christian authors, see Boulnois SC 582, 478–79 n. 1.

[48] It should be noted that the words Cyril is here putting in Julian's mouth are evidently contrary to Julian's express (but not innocent?) policy of religious toleration; see Ammianus 22.5.3–4; Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.4.6–9.

[49] Plato, *R.* 10.617e3–5; these lines (and the broader context of the Myth of Er from which it derives) had become a staple of Neoplatonist discussions of free will, as is clear from Porphyry, *Liber.Arbit.* fr. 268 (where the phrase is cited at line 32); cf. *ad Nemert.* fr. 277 (cited at *c. Iul.* 3.8.12–19). The connection to free will had, however, also received considerable attention among Cyril's Christian predecessors; see Clement, *Str.* 5.14.136.4; cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. in Cant.* (GNO 6, pp.160.17–161.1); *Anim. et. Res.* (GNO 3.3, p.76.1); *Hom. Opif.* 16 (PG 44.184b, with nearly identical wording to Cyril); Theodoret, *Affect.* 6.57. For discussion, see Boulnois, SC 582, 38–39.

Julian

For if [God] does not want anyone to be worshipped, why do you worship this bastard son of his whom he never recognized or regarded as his own?[50] *This, too, I will in fact demonstrate without any difficulty.*[51] *But you, however, for a reason I cannot understand, foist upon him a counterfeit son.*[52]

Cyril

Now then it is true that the God of the universe rejects the obligation of "worshipping other gods,"[53] since he is by nature the only true Craftsman and Lord of the universe, and what is appropriate to the divine being is appropriate for him alone. But I have no idea what Julian means in calling the Son a "*bastard*," and he is instead warring against God and letting loose this outrageous and impudent discourse against such highly exalted mysteries. And he claims he can easily prove this assertion, since lying comes as easy to him as riding a horse on the open plain.[54] In fact, we place under the all-holy God neither a "*bastard*" nor a [358]
"*counterfeit*" son but instead confess that his own proper Word, who is God, naturally proceeded from him; this we will easily prove when it is the right time to engage in verbal sparring on this point.[55]

Always[56] taking up his shield to defend Plato's words and putting his recitations[57] ahead of the sacred writings, Julian again indicts us, asking why we, after taking our leave from Greek eloquence, have sided with the words of truth and recognized the one who is truly God by nature, despite the fact that Moses, he says, "*hymns*" God's qualities less than he

[50] Although Celsus (at Origen *Cels.* 2.31) and possibly Porphyry (*Chr.* fr. 85 Harnack = Augustine, *Ep.* 102.28 = *dubium* 120D Becker) had already complained of the Christian belief that the supreme God could have a son, the precise language here ("bastard son" and "counterfeit") is applied to the Son apparently only by "Arian" theologians (at least according to their critics); see Boulnois, SC 582, 480–81 n. 1, who notes that Julian may well have drawn his language from "Arian" sources.

[51] Elsewhere Julian offers anticipatory notes of his planned argument; see *c. Gal.* frs. 50.4; 51.3–5; 64.5–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.8; 7.1.14–15; 8.15.9–10). His comment here may refer to his discussions at *c. Gal.* frs. 62; 64; 79 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.1–2; 8.15–16; 10.1).

[52] *c. Gal.* fr. 31 Mas.; Wright 1923, 362–63. [53] See Deut 30:17. [54] Gk.: ἱππήλατον.

[55] Cyril will turn to the theology of the Son in book 8: a demonstration of the divinity of the Son and the Triune God (8.1–33) and of the doctrine of the incarnation (8.34–51).

[56] Although not providing a verbatim quotation, this paragraph is included as *c. Gal.* fr. 32 in Masaracchia's edition and, as the GCS apparatus notes, it may contain a vestige of Julian's wording in the description of a person "hymning" the deity, which recurs at Julian, *Caes.* 25.325a (cf. fr. 36 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 5.28.15], where Julian describes the sort of "imitation of God hymned among the Hebrews"). Most of the wording, however, seems more redolent of Cyril (see the GCS apparatus).

[57] Gk.: τὰ … ῥαψῳδούμενα.

ought, since he calls God "*jealous*" and quick-tempered, although he is most gentle and absolutely good.

5.13 But enough about these topics, since we have spoken about them at length and, I think, frequently. Nevertheless, since he loves slander and is brazen in his speech, come, come indeed, let us observe what other ideas besides these he contrives when he makes war against the worship
[359] of the Christians. For he says in addition,

Julian

Nowhere[58] *does God appear to be violent, or irritated, or provoked to anger, nor does he swear oaths, nor go one way and then the other in quick succession,*[59] *as Moses says he was in the case of Phineas. If any of you have read Numbers, you know what I am talking about. For after [Phineas], he says, took with his own hand "the man who was initiated into the mysteries of Beelphegor" along with the "woman" who had persuaded him, and "killed" them, having struck the women, he says, "in the womb"*[60] *with a shameful and most painful wound, God is made to say: "Phineas the son of Eleazar, the*
[360] *son of Aaron the priest, stopped my anger against the sons of Israel when I was jealous with jealousy among them and I did not utterly destroy the sons of Israel with my jealousy."*[61] *What could be more trivial than the reason for which God is falsely represented as provoked to anger by the author of this tale? If there were ten or fifteen, or let's say even one hundred – for surely they will not say there were a thousand, but let us grant that there were even this many who dared to transgress one of the laws ordained by God – what could be more unreasonable than the idea that six hundred thousand people had to be destroyed because of one thousand?*[62] *It seems better on all counts, at least to me, to preserve one bad man together with a thousand of the best men than to destroy a thousand together with the one.*[63]

[58] Presumably Julian means "nowhere" in Plato's writings, which he must have discussed in the material omitted by Cyril between the last fragment and the present one. For earlier and contemporary strictures against assigning passions to the supreme God, see Origen, *Cels.* 4.71, 73; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.23.3; Salustius, *De diis* 14.1.

[59] Oecolampadius adds *neque mutabilis esse* here and the GCS edition (following the spirit if not the letter of Neumann) inserts οὐδὲ τρεπτὸς ὤν; however, Boulnois (following Masaracchia) is probably correct in rejecting the inserted phrase of Oecolampadius as merely a doubling in the translation of the previous phrase (see Boulnois, SC 582, 484 n. 1).

[60] Julian here adopts much of the language of Num 25:3, 5. [61] Num 25:11.

[62] See Exod 12:37; Num 11:21.

[63] *c. Gal.* fr. 33 Mas.; Wright 1923, 362–65. Despite his present argument, Julian was, nonetheless, willing to inflict a penalty upon a multitude for the errors of a smaller number: according to Libanius, the emperor defended his decision to punish Antioch (including its pagan inhabitants) for the misconduct of its Christian citizens by quoting Hesiod's line that "often an entire city suffers due to a bad man" (Libanius, *Or.* 16.50, citing Hesiod, *Op.* 240).

Cyril

Next, Julian weaves this together with an extended discussion, claiming that the Maker of heaven and earth should not experience such cruel feelings of anger that he even intended, on many occasions, to consume the entire race of the Jews. *For, if*, he says, *the anger of even one hero and of an insignificant daemon*[64] *is difficult to endure for entire countries and cities, who could have withstood so great a God who became enraged at daemons, angels, or even humans?*[65]

5.14 So then, Julian supposes, as I said, that the supreme and inviolate nature differs little from the realm of our experience and that the temperaments he happens to have in the case of specific matters – let us too use words more appropriate to humans, if he wants – are of the same sort as [361] might occur also in our very own experience and are no different. And he likewise supposes that, because "anger" has admittedly been ascribed to God, there is a fire burning in God's heart along with a bitter and uncontrollable agitation, and, if he should be called "jealous," Julian will probably not hesitate to say that he suffers the same emotions as humans and is melting from the fire of envy.

But, I suppose, this way of thinking would belong to a deranged and insane mind, entirely ignorant of the properties that belong to the divine nature. For just as we claim it stands above the universe and is situated over it, not because it is exalted in a spatial sense but because of the preeminence of this nature and its incomparable difference, so also in the exact same way, I think, it leaps beyond the realm of our experience and is understood to be beyond every passion. And it weighs human actions, assigning various rewards of a most exalted kind to those who submit a neck responsive to its yoke, while on those whose hearts are stubborn and obdurate imposing punishments that are less than they deserve. [362]

For indeed we hold that bad and good people must not appear to have equal honor; but neither should an excessive tolerance widen the path towards apostasy for those who choose it, since they would then proceed unpunished to whatever they want; they would be carried off into illicit behavior, practically leaping away from him; and they would in all likelihood be dragged down to what is worse by bidding farewell even to those things upon which they would have been better off lingering. For how can the Craftsman of all be entirely good if he doesn't show providence over his own creation and make those dominated by respect for the good

[64] For the association of heroes and daemons, see e.g., Julian, *c. Her.* 5.210a; *in reg. Sol.* 24.145c.
[65] This quotation of Julian is numbered as a continuation of *c. Gal.* fr. 33 Mas. (just quoted).

to be still stronger thanks to his assistance, while making those who irreverently disregard the sacred oracles more prudent and reining them in with terrifying warnings, even adding the beating that is their due as the best means of aiding them? "For the one whom the Lord loves he disciplines," it says, "and he whips every son whom he accepts."[66]

5.15 Hence, whenever he pronounces punishment on certain people for their drunken ravings, it is then that he is said by us to have gotten "angry," despite the fact that he does not endure the experience of the passion of anger; and if it should happen that he does not want any of his
[363] associates to be drawn off somewhere from kinship[67] with him through their choosing to worship those who are not gods, it is then that we say he is "jealous," using a word drawn from our experience to indicate the matter at hand and having no other way of speaking about the power of his innate tender affection.[68] For it is not the case that he exults in those who are being destroyed but instead wants his subjects, and even more all those on the earth, to distinguish themselves by their virtuous achievements.

Furthermore, if God is also said to "*swear oaths*" to certain people, Julian ought to lay the blame upon those who are faithless for the fact that there is even a need for an oath. And when he does swear, he does so by his own glory, since he says, "I will lift up my hand unto heaven and I will swear by my right hand."[69] And again: "I have sworn by myself, says the Lord."[70] For it was not possible to swear by anyone else as though they surpassed, excelled, or exceeded his own glory.[71] In fact, when confirming some of the saints in their faith that the promises made to them would ultimately come to fulfillment, he would sometimes bind his
[364] word to them with an oath,[72] since his goal[73] was to erect for his worshippers an unshakeable faith using every possible method.

5.16 Furthermore, since Julian deems it worthy of utmost criticism that the God of the universe would sometimes change from anger to gentleness, come, let us respond to him on this point too by saying, "Woe to those who call evil good and good evil."[74] For, he is foolishly

[66] Prov 3:12 (= Heb 12:6). [67] Gk.: οἰκειότητος.
[68] For the explanation of biblical depictions of God's anger as anthropomorphisms, see Clement, *Paed.* 1.8, 74.4; Origen, *Cels.* 4.72; *Hom. in Ex.* 8.5. Cf. Augustine, *c. Adim.* 11; *Qu. in Hept.* 2.158; *C. D.* 9.5.
[69] Deut 32:40. [70] Gen 22:16; Jer 22:5; 49:13. [71] Cf. Heb 6:13.
[72] The preceding sentences of this paragraph (*c. Iul.* 5.15.11–19) were excerpted (though not in order) in the catena tradition and joined to a passage from *c. Iul.* 9.6.16–23. Cf. Cramer 1844, VII: 511.33–512.5. For an example of God using an oath to strengthen the faith of someone, see Cyril's discussion of Abraham at *c. Iul.* 10.40.
[73] Gk.: σκοπός. [74] Isa 5:20.

vilifying what in fact it would certainly have been better, and indeed wise, to consider worthy of the highest esteem. For the God of the universe is slow to anger, or rather, he is slow to pronounce the punishments appropriate for sinners, but is easily moved to let go of his anger and is eager to show mercy to those who are trapped in their sins.

For example, Israel made a calf in the desert and, forgetting the divine sign in Egypt, they were wanting to offer veneration to a calf.[75] And God was quite reasonably indignant at this and said to Moses the hierophant: "Go, quickly descend from here; for your people whom you led out of the land of Egypt have broken the law; they quickly went aside from the [365] path, which I commanded them; they made for themselves a calf and have bowed down to it and sacrificed to it, saying: 'These are your gods, Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.' And now, permit me and I shall crush them, since I have been provoked by my anger at them, and I shall make you into a great nation."[76] But when the all-wise Moses earnestly begged him to be gracious to the sinners, he said, "The Lord was merciful and preserved his people."[77] Indeed, one may on occasion observe certain earthly kings incited to absolute rage at those who out of foolishness have offended them, acceding to the entreaties of no one, whether to those who occupy the highest seats, or to those leading armies, or to any others decked out with the highest dignities. But God, who is so great and beyond all, accepts the prayers of one just man.

5.17 Perhaps our opponent will say: "Did he then change his mind? Did he realize what was best only after the fact? And does he have second thoughts? Yet surely someone who knows the future, and specifically that he will eventually cease being angry, should have avoided coming to this point from the outset." It is easy to see that, in choosing to hold such ideas he seems, at least to me, to have forgotten even his own forefathers. For he has perhaps forgotten Homer who said the following about his own gods: [366]

> […] and even the gods themselves are changeable.[78]

But, thanks to his exceedingly great stupidity, Julian has indicted God for actions that ought to have been admired instead, as would be clear without any difficulty at all, if one wanted to learn the plan[79] behind them. For it was surely necessary, yes necessary indeed, to show that those who have committed unholy deeds are liable to punishment, and it

[75] Cf. Exod 32:1–6. [76] Exod 32:7–10. [77] Exod 32:14.
[78] Homer, *Il.* 9.497; cited with a variant in Plato, *R.* 2.364d6 and Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 24.1 and 25.1.
[79] Gk.: οἰκονομίαν.

is for this reason that God is said to have been "angry." But, in addition to this, it was also necessary that those of us who came after Moses should learn the preeminence of God's innate tranquility and how much influence virtue has with him and the power of the prayers of the saints. Or doesn't this fact fill life with good hope? For, if he accepts the prayer of one just man even when, on occasion, a great multitude has been condemned for such terrible sins, shouldn't everyone take heart even if, entangled in human weakness, they crash into the sacred laws and see judgment hanging over their heads? For, the prayer of one just man is
[367] sufficient[80] as an aid to those who choose to repent.

5.18 Now since Julian takes Phineas' being jealous as a pretext for libel against God, come, yes come, and let us give a cursory overview of the story and also recall the very words of the sacred text so as to prove that yet again he is speaking futile nonsense on this point too. It is written as follows in *Numbers* (this is a Mosaic book): "And Israel lodged in Satim; and the people became profane so as to practice sexual immorality with the daughters of Moab. And they invited them to the sacrifices of their idols, and the people ate their sacrifices, and they bowed down to their idols. And Israel was initiated into the mysteries of Beelphegor; and the Lord was provoked to anger at Israel."[81] Is it then the case that their error was an insignificant one, something not sufficiently serious to be able to upset the virtue-loving nature and incite it to indignation? What miracles could have surpassed those the omnipotent God performed when he raised creation itself in revolt, so to speak, against the Egyptians' madness, in order that he might free Israel from unbearable slavery? For even heaven was emitting hail;[82] the earth, as it was written, was sending forth frogs;[83] the water was changing "into blood";[84] when "soot of a furnace" was dispersed throughout the air, "boils" were breaking out on
[368] the bodies "of the people."[85] Then Israel completely lost its senses and was captured by the beauty of wicked women so as to pursue these pleasures

[80] This clause would seem to echo the conception, though not the wording, of Jas 5:16.

[81] Num 25:1–3. This passage had been commented on by earlier and contemporary Christian exegetes as well as by Cyril himself (in *Ador.* 14 [PG 68.908bc] and *Is.* 15:1 [PG 70.397c]). For a discussion of patristic interpretation of the biblical episode, see Gaddis 2005, 182–83; Boulnois 2011c, 267–70. On Cyril's interpretation of the episode here and its relation to his view on religious violence, see Crawford 2023b, 7–8.

[82] Cyril's recollection of the plagues is not given in the biblical order (as Boulnois notes, there is a close parallel at Cyril's *Is.* 1:1 [PG 70.16c], which seems to have prompted his enumeration here, or vice versa; for comparison, see *Is.* 13:13 [PG 70.357cd] and 44:8 [PG 70.925d]); on the plague of hail, see Exod 9:13–26.

[83] On the plague of frogs, see Exod 8:1–14.

[84] On the plague of blood, see Exod 7:14–24.

[85] On the plague of boils, see Exod 9:8–12.

without restraint.[86] And indeed, their mind even advanced to such a point of stupidity that they chose to worship the wooden statue honored among them, with an unholy disregard for any and all reverence towards the one true God by nature.

5.19 Thus, since it followed that the evil had to be restrained in some way and not allowed to spread through the entire race by starting from just a few people and in no time overtaking the rest of them as well, some of the apostates fell at the hands of the faithful, in order that the path towards shameful conduct might usefully be made rough instead of smooth thanks to the fear of suffering. It was right at that time and only then that Phineas too, since a man was pushing the limits of impudence and falling into the embraces[87] of a foreign woman – and this openly! – "took a barbed lance"[88] and made short work of them both; for he pierced the penetrated along with the penetrator.[89] Look for me here at the compassionate God who often seizes upon even a harsh act as an opportunity for clemency: for he says "Phineas the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, stopped my anger against the sons of Israel when I was jealous with jealousy among them and I did not utterly destroy the [369] sons of Israel with my jealousy. So I said: 'Behold, I am giving to him […] and to his offspring after him an eternal covenant of priesthood, because he was jealous for his God and provided atonement for the sons of Israel.'"[90] For since, he says, [Phineas] was moved by his love for God, practically taking upon himself "my jealousy," and thus let loose his hand against those who had committed unholy deeds, [God] ceased from his wrath; and then [God] even deemed him to be worthy of rewards, for, it says, "he provided atonement for the sons of Israel."

But he who understands nothing that is excellent or good claims that "*the reason*" was "*trivial*"[91] which caused God to desist from the obligatory incitement to anger towards those who had sinned in this way. And yet, how could it not be the case that Julian, out of his extreme ignorance, has allowed himself to be carried away by base and fraudulent ideas

[86] That is, in the Phineas episode.

[87] Literally, "interweaving oneself together with" (συνεπλέκετο) a woman; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.5.20; 6.7.3; 7.11.25; 7.14.6.

[88] Num 25:7.

[89] The translation here attempts to capture the alliterative pun in Cyril's Greek: διεπερόνησε γὰρ ὁμοῦ τῷ πορνεύσαντι τὴν πεπορνευμένην. More accurately, Cyril's terminology refers to prostitution rather than penetration more broadly.

[90] Num 25:11–13 (the first sentence of which was already quoted by Julian at *c. Gal.* fr. 33.9–12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.13.14–17).

[91] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 33.12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.13.17).

when he attempts to vilify that which doubtless he ought instead to deem worthy of all admiration? For when God saw Phineas, practically having put on the breastplate[92] of a pious and faithful jealousy and marshalling his wrath against those who dishonor divine worship, he was delighted at him and pardoned everyone else of the offenses for which they under-
[370] standably would have suffered the most severe punishment.

5.20 For while the divine and supreme nature always abhors someone with a sinful and teetering heart and an effeminate mind prone to waywardness and apostasy from the good, it delights in those who are steadfast, who habitually walk in the straight path, and who avoid falling on one side or the other, those who, with a well-grounded intellect, have a firm grip on their pious devotion to him. Because of even one such person, God often lavishes his mercy upon an innumerable multitude, and on occasion even upon those who had been harshly condemned.

For example, when all Jerusalem was once gripped by no ordinary faults and had incited the virtue-loving Intellect against herself on account of her inclination to wallow in each and every thing condemned by the law, and this quite eagerly, the just Judge again wanted to let loose punishments upon them. But when the prophet Jeremiah offered prayers for her, he immediately heard God saying: "Go about in the streets of Jerusalem […] and look in her public squares, and if you should find a man, if he is someone who practices justice and loves faithfulness, I will
[371] be gracious to Jerusalem, says the Lord."[93] Observe, therefore, how God considers one person to be "equal in value to many people"[94] and "saves" a populous city "together with one" just and good man, rather than destroy one just man together with many impious.[95]

Hence, when some people at that time had thoroughly deviated into unbridled behavior and were utterly ruined, wasn't it necessary that God should express an appropriate concern for those who had not yet suffered this fate, that the impulses of the others should be curbed by the punishment applied to a few, and that by terrifying warnings they should be directed towards their responsibility to stick firmly to what is best? Is it then the case that God, who is all justice, was unjust? Or did he have an unreasonable aim in view when he did these things?

Indeed, isn't it impious to rebuke his judgments in such a foolhardy manner? Julian's own Porphyry, for example, says in the treatise *To*

[92] Cf. Eph 6:14. [93] Jer 5:1.
[94] Homer, *Il.* 11.514 (also cited in Plato, *Smp.* 214b7 and *Plt.* 297e11–12).
[95] Cf. *c. Iul.* 5.13.22–24 (quoting Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 33 Mas.); 5.22.25–27.

Nemertius: "As a result, his [Nemertius'?] book, which dares to give God a lesson in justice, is discovered to be full of the greatest injustice when one unrolls [and reads] it."[96] Accordingly, the verdict of God in every instance would be reasonably understood to be – and in truth is – holy and entirely blameless, and to think otherwise would be a disease of a crazed mind and an indictable offense.

5.21 But since Julian hates arguments from us, let him listen again to Porphyry, who writes as follows:

> Not only for the benefit of the whole and <for>[97] the continuation of [the whole's] harmony does [God] adapt one thing to another, a span of time belonging to each part individually, but he is already the protector, savior, and doctor of all.[98] Didn't he set the pattern, on the one hand, for human doctors who use their God-given skill to foresee what will happen to the whole [body] and either cut some of the parts, or cauterize others, or mortify others, or amputate[99] others for the sake of saving the whole? Even if, despite knowing that the doctor does this for the sake of saving the whole, mothers and nurses who are present still often sob and weep mournfully, nevertheless the sensible father, when he is present, both urges on the doctor and takes away food from the weeping [child] for their benefit. If God has set this pattern for human doctors, then would he, in his protection of the whole, have neglected the part that needs to die and depart from the others, like [the removal of] a single toe from the whole foot for the benefit of the entire body?[100] For surely, if we were able to track down[101] the divine reasoning, we would doubtless realize that for the [greater] good he prevents the birth of some at the outset, while for others [372]

[96] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 278 Smith. As with all the other fragments of the *ad Nemert.*, this is a quotation that occurs in Cyril alone of a work that is attested by him alone; see fr. 276 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 3.8.3–11) with note *ad loc*. The current fragment's initial Ὥστε most naturally introduces a result clause and, as such, alerts us to the fact that Cyril is selectively quoting only the second half of a larger thought, in a manner similar to his quotation of Julian at *c. Iul.* 3.29.5. Furthermore, although Smith includes the next sentence as continuing the quotation of Porphyry, we have followed both Riedweg and Boulnois in taking the end of the quotation here because the following sentence is redolent of standard Cyrillian language (e.g., "verdict," "holy and blameless," "sickness," and "indictment"; see Boulnois, SC 582, 505 n. 3; Johnson forthcoming).

[97] <εἰς> added by Smith; followed by the GCS edition.

[98] On the part–whole argument of providence, as well as the analogy of God to a doctor, see Plato, *Leg.* 10.903cd; Plotinus 3.2.3; and cf. Theodoret, *Affect.* 6.46 (citing Plato, *Leg.* 10); 6.48; 6.62 (citing Plotinus).

[99] Gk.: διελεῖν.

[100] Cf. Porphyry, *Marc.* 34.518–20, where control of the body is likened to the amputation of bodily limbs: even more, "be ready to cut off the whole body for the sake of the soul" (to which one can compare Christ's words at Matt 5:29–30).

[101] The metaphor of hunting for truth, ultimately drawn from Plato, seems to have been favored by Porphyry more than other Platonists of his time; see *ad Nemert.* fr. 276 (at *c. Iul.* 3.8.6) with the note there.

> he gives prior indication that they will be harmful, and upon still others he has bestowed death as the reward for piety.[102]

Despite the fact that, prior to Julian, Porphyry is seen to have waged war against God's glory in a great many books,[103] I nonetheless think the foregoing is sufficient as confirmation of the sorts of things he thought and wrote.

5.22 And yet, I will add still one further snippet from him, which goes something like this:

> Chrysippus, the follower of Socrates,[104] did not think it right to say "Who knows [why]?" in response to things that happen, but rather "This was absolutely for the best." For unless it is possible to sketch out an administration better than the divine one, we must surely suppose that what happens is better the way it is. For is it not true in your own experience [Nemertius] that, when you received from the emperor down here the task of exercising providence over a certain portion of the human empire[105] and obeyed the laws for the benefit of the political order, it was impossible for you to maintain a lawful political order in any other way than to exile some of your subjects, confiscate the property of others, and even condemn still others to death; and is it not the case that you did not preserve the life of all its citizens, since doing so was not in the interests of everyone? So then, when it comes to one who administers so great a world as this, are we really not going to let him administer his own realm in the manner he deemed right for the whole, without being called to account by us, even when he proceeds by means of deaths and changes [of fortune] and by the indefiniteness of one's lifetime?[106]

[373]

Why, therefore, does Julian not do what is holy? Why does he shamelessly attack the divine judgments and condemn on a charge of inequity the substance that weighs all things in a holy manner? And why does he cry out against that anger which refashions into a better state people who disregard what is best and moves those who are vacillators towards preferring more solid ground? As the father of your false worship recommends, let us "leave it" [to God], as though he were a physician, to amputate

[102] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 279 Smith.

[103] Cyril alludes here to Porphyry's *Against the Christians*; see *c. Iul.* 1.38.1–2 with note.

[104] For the identity of this Chrysippus, see our note to the earlier citation of this fragment (*ad Nemert.* fr. 282 Smith) at *c. Iul.* 3.31.15–16.

[105] On this possible reference to a governorship held by Nemertius, see our note to the earlier citation of this fragment (*ad Nemert.* fr. 282 Smith) at *c. Iul.* 3.31.21–22.

[106] Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 282 Smith (cited already *c. Iul.* 3.31.15–28). Although Cyril does not explicitly state that the quotation comes from the *ad Nemert.*, the attribution to this work seems likely given the fact that both here and in the case of its earlier citation in book 3 it is given immediately after quotations that are expressly attributed to that work.

some small part for "the preservation" of "the whole body." Permit him like a judge to use legal regulations[107] to rein in his subjects by the removal of bad people. For, indeed, as I said already,[108] it is not the case that good people were destroyed along with the wicked, but rather a wicked and numberless crowd "were saved together with one good man,"[109] I mean Phineas, of course; and he has been honored [by God], not because the woman was pierced through with a savage blow, but rather because he prudently filled his heart with zeal[110] for God and quite fervently took up arms against the apostates. [374]

5.23 But perhaps Julian does not like the sound of apostates having to undergo punishment. For he knows, yes he knows indeed, that he himself is numbered among such people and there is no way he could avoid the most severe punishment for having cast down his shield, with the facts themselves proving that he is a coward who cares nothing at all for virtue[111] and who, by the smooth path of deception, has rolled into the pit of impiety. But perhaps he imagines that he could rival God as a legislator[112] and can redirect the meaning of the divine decrees to whatever seems right to him. For he always speaks lies about the God-breathed scripture, at one point claiming that the hierophant "*Moses was acting as a demagogue rather than speaking the truth when he composed his statements about God, statements that are neither correct nor indeed appropriate for the divine*"; while at another point he maintains that "*Ezra*" added some things from his own ideas [to the writings of Moses].[113] [375]

This attack of his is also extremely vindictive: he pretends to be fair towards God in order that he might give the impression that he has good reasons for saying that [Moses'] statements about God are poorly composed and even to pour disgrace all over the sacred writings. But "a treacherous man will not catch his prey,"[114] as it has been written. "For

[107] Gk.: πολιτείαις συννόμοις. [108] See above, *c. Iul.* 5.19–20. [109] Cf. above, *c. Iul.* 5.20.20–21.

[110] The Greek ζῆλον could equally designate "jealousy" (as above at *c. Iul.* 5.19.19, drawing on Num 25:11) and seems here to bear both senses: Phineas embodied God's jealousy in his violent action, which was prompted by zeal for God.

[111] Literally, "some battle-fleer" (φυγοπόλεμος). On Julian's apostasy, see *c. Iul.* Dedic.4 with note.

[112] Cf. Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 278 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 5.20.31–33) on being a teacher of justice to God.

[113] Although given in indirect discourse, this sentence is numbered among the fragments of Julian as *c. Gal.* fr. 34 Mas. We have followed the GCS editors in marking off portions of it as representing Julian's wording, though caution is warranted. The anonymous Hellene of Macarius goes further than the claim here by asserting that Ezra entirely rewrote the Mosaic law since it had been lost in the burning of the temple (*Apocr.* 3.3.1 with note at Goulet 2003, 391). See Boulnois, SC 582, 512 n. 1; Boswell 2022, 265–71; Cook 2004, 319–20.

[114] Prov 12:27.

we," who have the mind of Christ,[115] "are not ignorant of his schemes,"[116] as the all-wise Paul said.

5.24 Moreover, the fact that Julian has attained the highest pinnacle of
[376] impiety should once more be clear from the following; for he said,

Julian

It is indeed appropriate to compare him to the mildness of Lycurgus and the tolerance of Solon, or the equity and kindness of the Romans towards malefactors.[117]

Cyril

How can this insolent man be unafraid when he compares the God over all to humans, and even more when he says that the maker of heaven and earth is no better than humans, maintaining that the "Wisdom that is the artisan of all things"[118] is inferior to the equity of humans and that he who authoritatively apportions to existing things the properties that determine what they are is all but cast aside, far behind those who are good in the human realm? For all understanding and every form of virtue
[377] is from the Craftsman of all, and indeed likewise an appetite for good things has been implanted in nature by him. It is, therefore, abundantly clear that it is the wicked and God-hating spirit that has spoken through Julian, and perhaps it would not be out of place if one chose to liken him even to the dragon who is the source of evil, or rather to the snake in Paradise, which was a mediator of the devil's words even though it was in appearance alone – for the words were not from it but rather from the one who was speaking through it.[119] But while that [snake] tricked only one woman, this man, who is the most skilled imitator of the devil's perversity, is attempting to "corrupt the whole world,"[120] "lifting his horn aloft and speaking injustice against God," as it has been written.[121]

5.25 But since he claims that both Solon and indeed also Lycurgus were the mildest of men, and has even testified to their tolerance, we now must also say the following. Now, Solon was a legislator for the Athenians, Lycurgus for the Lacedaemonians. Therefore, when they were providing a beneficial service to cities or country districts and were laying down the laws for each, did they omit to mention that those found guilty

[115] Cf. 1 Cor 2:16. [116] 2 Cor 2:11. [117] *c. Gal.* fr. 35 Mas.; Wright 1923, 364–65. [118] Wis 7:21.
[119] Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.20–22. [120] Isa 13:5. [121] Ps 74(75):6.

of shameful crimes must pay penalties, and did they intend for the choice of an unholy and unlawful life to go unpunished? Or did they perhaps [378] stipulate penalties that were proportional to each misdeed and thereby persuade small and great to be prudent and render them practitioners of orderly and good behavior?

If, then, they did not view such conduct as being very important, let Julian concede the point and I will rest my case; for what kind of virtue does a legislator have who has disregarded the most profitable things of all? But if, on the contrary, preventing wicked conduct and rebuking bad morals was for them a serious matter of the utmost consequence – for there was no other way to vanquish the laxity of those who do not value the best way of life – should one for this reason no longer think of them as mild and tolerant? Although they voided the laws of Draco,[122] they decreed that his laws pertaining to murderers ought to remain in force, praising them, I would imagine, and in no way being displeased with them, since, although they could have repealed them, they ordered that they be preserved and remain in effect.

But, in case it is necessary for me to speak in defense of legislators, besides being mild and tolerant, one would, I believe, say they should also possess a characteristic hatred of evil. Thus, even if they occasionally determined harsh punishments for wicked sinners who chose a lifestyle beyond the laws, one could say they arrived at this judgment not as [379] people tyrannized by anger, but instead as defenders of justice who condemn shameful people out of a strong hatred of wickedness and guide them towards a better state, by, on the one hand, distinguishing what is naturally unjust from what is usually beneficial, while, on the other hand, using fear as a most useful aid against those who prefer laxity and threatening them with punishment like a sort of goad. **5.26** And, I suppose, if one were to take into account the disposition and intent of lawgivers in each of the laws they have made, whenever one sees them measuring out brilliant rewards for good deeds and bringing forward praises appropriate to each, it would not be misleading to say that they took the utmost

[122] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.15.1–2. It may be significant that Cyril has included Draco in the discussion of the earliest Greek lawgivers, although he was never mentioned by Julian (neither in *c. Gal.* fragments nor apparently anywhere in his corpus), since this seventh-century legislator was remembered popularly for his harsh legislation (inspiring the modern epithet "draconian") and thus highlighted the need for improvement in Greek (or at least Athenian) legal history (cf. Plutarch, *Sol.* 17); this reference to Draco thus marks a shift away from the more general invocation to him alongside Solon and Lycurgus at *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.449d–452a). At the same time, Cyril shows no greater knowledge of Draco's legislation or Solon's reforms than he could have found in Eusebius, *Chron.* II, p.99b.18–21 Helm; p.187 Karst or *P.e.* 10.7.17.

delight in these people and placed the highest value upon the duty of going through life in an irreproachable manner; but whenever one sees them censuring evil deeds, it would not be inappropriate to say that they were full of anger. For in the kinds of laws they issue it is not difficult to see the dispositions within the souls of the legislators all but sketched out.[123] Accordingly, even though the very act of threatening punishments for shameful and improper conduct would understandably make one suspect it is motivated by wrath, nevertheless the legislators have not
[380] experienced the emotion of wrath.

Something like this is also how you should understand what is going on in the case of God, or rather, something far beyond this, since his ways belong to a realm far removed from our experience and transcend every creature. Well, then, Your Excellency, when it comes to the laws of Solon and Lycurgus – and, I might add, Draco's too – if someone decides to insult them, putting his foot in the mud as the saying goes,[124] and is invariably and without exception subjected to the punishment meted out to transgressors, is it then unjust that someone who is lax towards the divine commandment and liable to pay the penalty suffers punishment?

Accordingly, given that God says, "You shall worship the Lord your God and shall serve him alone,"[125] and likewise, "You shall have no other gods but me,"[126] wasn't it necessary that the punishment of death should be given to "those who were initiated into the mysteries of Beelphegor"[127] and had all but sold themselves into apostasy for such loathsome pleasures with shameful women?

5.27 Furthermore, I think it necessary for me to say the following as well: did Solon and Lycurgus, whom he likewise claims to have surely been the most eminent of legislators, take care to issue laws for the Greeks requiring them to pay heed to the gods honored among them by
[381] making sacrifices and serving them? Of course I think this is the case and not otherwise. For the matter is so serious to them that the worst punishments were decreed for those who were apprehended and indicted for laxity. What need is there to mention the laws that treated temple-robbers as violators of the gods?[128] So then, since they viewed as especially important the duty of guarding against any form of offending the gods –

[123] Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.27.12–15, where Cyril says the "founders of the races" issued laws "that resemble their own way of thinking."

[124] In fact, as Boulnois notes (SC 582, 521 n. 2), Cyril (intentionally?) reverses the proverbial expression "to keep one's foot out of the mud" (cf. Aeschylus, *Ch.* 697; Zenobius 3.62); but see Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. in Cant.* 11 (GNO 6, p.330.22–23) for a similar expression.

[125] Matt 4:10 = Luke 4:8; cf. Deut 6:13 = 10:20. [126] Exod 20:3.

[127] Num 25:5; cf. Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 33.6–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.13.10–11). [128] Cf. e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 9.854d1.

or rather impure daemons – isn't Julian clearly in the wrong for claiming that punishment was unjustly inflicted upon those who had insulted God's worship in a brazen and unholy manner?

And indeed, they say that the oracular daemon at Pytho, namely Apollo, spoke from his tripods and declared that Socrates was the wisest of all men.[129] And while there was much admiration for the man among the Greeks, he was imprisoned and ended his human life with hemlock. Now the accusation brought against him by his accusers was that he added "new daemons" to the gods that exist among the Greeks.[130] If this is the case, then was it not necessary that those who dishonored the God of the universe, who instead of service under him chose dutiful submission to Beelphegor, and who worshipped others besides God, should undergo the punishment of Socrates – if not with hemlock, then by a different means – a punishment that was not discordant, I think, with the very laws of the Greeks, or rather those who laid them down, namely [382] Solon, Lycurgus, and, before them, Draco?[131] Accordingly, even if certain people whose duty it is to issue laws should be mild and tolerant people, they would not cease being good and mild when they punish the wicked.

Now since he claims the Romans are benevolent and forgiving towards certain "*malefactors*," how can he ignore the fact that offenses against humans are much less serious than those against God? For, erring against the nature that is beyond all is not equivalent to offending someone on earth, since, as much as his ways surpass our ways,[132] to the same degree, I think, will the significance of crimes [against God] surpass the rest; and the particularities of the punishment itself will also follow in a manner that is equitable and proportionate to each offense.[133]

5.28 As though clearly and unambiguously declaring that the nature which is impervious to passions like ours – in fact, to everything that naturally causes distress – and which surpasses every intellect, is tyrannized by wrath and is provoked by impulses towards anger, Julian again [383] spews forth some words better suited to old women, which stink of extreme stupidity, and states,

[129] See Plato, *Ap.* 21a and 23b, although Cyril may be drawing here on Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 36.1.

[130] See Plato, *Ap.* 24b.

[131] Cyril's alignment of the Greek laws with the Mosaic law in a shared concern for punishing acts of religious deviance is strikingly opposite from earlier Christian appropriations of Socrates as a model of rejecting traditional notions about the divine under the guidance of the true Logos; see most notably Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 5.4, with discussion by Johnson 2017, especially 630.

[132] For the concept, see Isa 55:9 (although Cyril makes no verbal allusions); alternatively, Cyril may be proleptically using Julian's language, exhibited in the first sentence of the following fragment, *c. Gal.* fr. 36.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.28.8).

[133] For a similar argument, see Augustine, *C. D.* 21.11–13.

Julian

On the basis of the following, observe also the degree to which our ways are better than their ways. The philosophers command us to imitate the gods as much as is possible[134] *and [they say] that such imitation consists in contemplation of what exists. And it is probably clear and does not even need to be said that this takes place without passion and depends on an absence of passion.*[135] *Consequently, we assimilate ourselves to God to the degree that we enter a state free from passion when intent on contemplation of what*
[384] *exists.*

But what sort of imitation of God is hymned among the Hebrews? – Anger, rage, and wild jealousy. For it says, "Phineas […] stopped my anger against the sons of Israel when I was jealous with jealousy among them."[136] *God, in fact, having found someone who was equally indignant and aggrieved, is seen to put aside his own indignation.*

Often in the scripture Moses has been made to say this and things like this about God.[137]

Cyril

If then, Your Excellency, submitting to wicked daemons, or rather apostate angels, is obviously better than conducting one's affairs under God and being ruled by him alone, then your side should gain the victory. But if, on the contrary, doing so is abominable to those who have a beautiful and strong mind and who "love the sight"[138] of true piety and if, conversely, it is productive of every happiness and is truly thrice-desired to gain unerring knowledge of the one that truly exists and rules
[385] the universe, from which every form of virtue shines forth and comes to us and from which gush up, as if from a fountain, good things and the distribution of heavenly gifts – if all this is true, how could the ways of the Greeks[139] still be preeminent? Rather, won't the ways of Christians,[140] sweetly smelling of the myrrh of undefiled service, supersede their claptrap by an incomparable array of differences?

[134] The notion of imitating or assimilating oneself to the divine "as much as possible" was common in later Platonism and Stoicism, having its roots in Plato, *Tht.* 176b1–3 (cf. *R.* 6.500b8–d2; 10.613a7–b1); see, e.g., Plotinus 1.2.1; Julian, *ad deor. matr.* 5.184a; *c. Her.* 19.225d; *Caes*. 34.333c. See Männlein-Robert 2013. Cyril himself had already alluded to the concept at *c. Iul.* 4.3.33–34.

[135] Gk.: ἀπαθείᾳ. For the equation of ἀπάθεια with assimilation to the divine, see Plotinus 1.2.6.25–26; Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.34.3 (cited at *c. Iul.* 2.37.21–25); Julian, *ad deor. matr.* 12.192a.

[136] Num 25:11. [137] *c. Gal.* fr. 36 Mas.; Wright 1923, 364–67.

[138] Cf. Plato, *R.* 5.475e4, cited below at *c. Iul.* 5.38.15. [139] Gk.: τὰ Ἑλλήνων.

[140] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

5.29 Yet, since the mind of the Greeks has sunk in the quagmire of deception[141] and has a "lie" as its "hope," as the prophet says,[142] it is worthwhile to peer also into the depth of this thinking, which he supposes has been worked out with such great wisdom to suit his purpose. For "the wise have ordered us," he says, to "*imitate the gods* insofar as it is achievable." And the only way this may be accomplished is solely through the "*contemplation of what exists*" and, of course, through an "*absence of passion*" – by "*absence of passion*" meaning, I suppose, the absence of anger in addition to possessing the other virtues: one must first welcome them in and keep them in one's breast, and so, in this manner, imprint oneself[143] with the imitation of God insofar as is possible and carefully practice the habits of the entirely beautiful and skilled artistry that leads to this goal. [386]

Now then, the claim that a mind that is still[144] and unconcerned with worldly affairs is required for those intent on approaching the true vision of God[145] is one I myself would make as well as everyone habituated to thinking in a correct manner. For the Craftsman and Lord of the universe carries us away to such a state with the words, "Be still and know that I am God."[146] The state of being beyond rage and "*free from the passion*" of the waves of anger,[147] insofar as this is attainable, is surely a singular good worth acquiring and one of those that habitually conform us to God. Since this is agreed upon by all and is in fact true, it immediately appears necessary that we must think of the divine not as quick-tempered and harsh, but rather as entirely free from rage and anger.

Tell me, then, given that the all-wise Moses says the Craftsman and artisan of all things is not one of those falsely named gods who are

[141] The metaphor of a muddy quagmire in moral, doctrinal, or wider religious terms (here βόρβορος) is frequent in Cyril's corpus; see *c. Iul.* 1.17.11; 7.39.14; 9.37.5; and Boulnois, SC 582, 528 n. 1 for other select references.

[142] Isa 28:15.

[143] The closest parallel to Cyril's use of this metaphor seems to be Clement, *Str.* 6.15.115.1 (Ὁ γνωστικὸς ἄρα τὴν προσεχεστέραν ἀναμάσσεται ὁμοιότητα, τὴν διάνοιαν τὴν τοῦ διδασκάλου, "the Gnostic is imprinted with the more immediate likeness, namely the thought of the teacher"); but see also Clement, *Paed.* 1.12.98.3, which is likewise paired with "practicing" (τὸν σωτήριον ὄντως ἀναμαξώμεθα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν βίον· ἐνθένδε ἤδη τὴν ἐπουράνιον μελετῶντες πολιτείαν, "let us really be imprinted with the salvific life of our Savior; and then practicing the heavenly conduct").

[144] Literally, "at leisure" (σχολαίω), but here translated so as to catch the resonance with the passage from the Psalms, quoted in the following sentence.

[145] Gk.: θεοπτίαν. [146] Ps 45(46):11.

[147] For the metaphor "waves of anger," cf. *c. Iul.* 5.37.26; *Ps.* 36:8 (PG 69.928c, which is misattributed to Origen at PG 17.125a).

unknown and partial,[148] but instead is the God who truly exists and possesses the glory of lordship over all things as a property of his essence,[149] how can this man say without any fear that the imitation of God among the Hebrews consists of "*anger, rage, and wild jealousy*"? Does he not realize that he is arguably making the divine susceptible to
[387] human passion and making the one through whom and in whom all things were brought into existence one of our number?

5.30 In fact, the divine scripture, in composing discourses about [the divine], does not speak about it in words appropriate to it, as it is by nature, but in a way that we ourselves might be able to understand and to speak.[150] For, by thus employing terms drawn from our experience and expressions designating concrete particulars, it focuses our attention upon subtle images and draws us up to conceptions that transcend what is spoken. For this reason also, it often attributes parts of the human body to [the divine], using language that is, in a sense, strictly inappropriate,[151] and elegantly draws us up to subtle contemplation from examples, as it were, in our own experiences. Just as, then, it sometimes treats the incorporeal – despite its being simple and incomposite, without magnitude and quantity – as composed of limbs, with each part, as it
[388] were, hinting obliquely at one of the divine nature's inherent properties – the eye hinting at its being all-seeing,[152] the ears at its being all-hearing, the hand doubtless at its creative activity, and of course the feet at the smooth and, so to speak, easily traversed path it takes towards each of its deeds – so too, if perchance "anger" is mentioned in the case of God, it would, on the basis of our experience, induce us to understand that, if he had in fact been able to experience passion, he would have undergone it, brought to this point by the quality of people's actions.

For the absence of passion is a natural property of the divine. Nevertheless, that which is under his hand and yoke should not for this reason be without blame when it disregards what is proper nor should those who lie under his scepter be allowed to leap into apostasy with

[148] The ἀνὰ μέρος here recalls Julian's notion of ethnarch gods and the claim that the Hebrew God was merely the god of one part of the world; cf. μερικόν at *c. Gal.* fr. 28.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46.12).

[149] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς.

[150] Origen, *Cels.* 4.71 likewise appealed to God's accommodation in the Bible to human understanding in his response to Celsus' criticism of the biblical ascription of anger and threats to God; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.15.1–8 with note. For Cyril's broader conception of the accommodation of biblical language to the limits of human understanding, see Boulnois 1994, 29–54.

[151] Gk.: κατακεχρημένη. On the importance of the category of κατάχρησις for explaining scriptural language in terms of accommodation to human limits, see Boulnois 1994, 65–71.

[152] Cf. Cyril's interpretation of the Eye of Horus at *c. Iul.* 9.15.

impunity, but I maintain that they must be severely tormented and that doing so would be exceedingly just, since being unsupervised is detrimental to the wicked, just as the absence of punishment is detrimental to those children who habitually misbehave.

Therefore, whenever the quality and impact of actions committed by any person at all require a show of anger from God, if this should eventually appear to have been inflicted upon them, it is then that he is also said "to have gotten angry," with the saints having used the language of our experience so we might understand that, if it had been possible to articulate clearly God's properties in words transcending humanity, the word "wrath" would not have been applied to him. It would, therefore, be necessary to consider the limit of our thinking and the insufficiency of our language. [389]

Indeed, someone might say to him: "What are you doing, dear sir? You blame those who talk about God for their habit of speaking of his properties in a manner that is inferior to what was required. In that case, indict your own nature since it doesn't know how to rival the intelligible heights of the divine preeminence and falls short of the honors of sovereignty, lacking words sufficient to express things that transcend intellect."

5.31 Furthermore, let Julian answer this question for me: if in fact someone made his goal the duty of living mildly and temperately, which of his gods should he imitate to avoid missing his goal?[153] Perhaps Julian would say "murderous Ares," to use Homer's epithet, the god whom he has in fact called "blight to mortals" and "stormer of walls," as well as "bloodthirsty," and, as I said,[154] "rager" and "one born for evil"?![155]

But let us pass him by if you wish to do so and examine instead Athena "of a mighty father," who is shameless and a "dog fly," always "making the gods clash in strife,"[156] since she too is always concerned with military tactics and they call her the most warlike of daemons.[157] And they give a venerable account about her, since they say she doesn't rage like that god, [390]

[153] The language of "missing the mark" (ἁμάρτοι σκοποῦ) in philosophical literature is at least as early as Aristotle, *EN* 2.6, 1106b31–33.

[154] See *c. Iul.* 4.6.25–27.

[155] See Homer, *Il.* 4.441 ("murderous Ares"); *Il.* 5.31, 455 ("blight to mortals," "stormer of walls," and "blood-stained"); *Il.* 5.831 ("rager" and "one born for evil"). Cyril's inclusion of "stormer of walls" (τειχεσιβλήτης) instead of the dominant reading (τειχεσιπλῆτα) is a witness to this variant that is attested at least as early as the Alexandrian librarian of the third century BC, Zenodotus; see the app. crit. of Munro and Allen 1920 and Boulnois, SC 582, 535 n. 1.

[156] See Homer *Il.* 5.747; 8.391; *Od.* 1.101; also Hesiod *Th.* 587; cf. *c. Iul.* 3.2.20 ("of a mighty father"); *Il.* 21.394 ("dog fly making the gods clash in strife").

[157] While obviously bearing polemical weight here, in fact the Olympian deities could be designated δαίμονες already in Homer (without, of course, the Christian connotations of being an evil spirit or less than a deity); see Chantraine 1954, especially 51–54.

I mean the "stormer of walls," but rather conducts matters related to battles and warfare in a thoughtful and reflective way. But it seems to me that this won't help her at all to gain the appearance of mildness that is required. For do those who weave together prudence with courageous deeds in battle and war really intend to be weaker than the enemy force when they come to face them, or do they make the crucial victory their first priority, even if it happens to be true that they wage battle against their enemies in a thoughtful manner? Isn't the answer obvious? For when they march forth – and it is not without wrath that they do so, even if they are said to do this thoughtfully – how could they possess within themselves the beauty of an authentic and sound mildness?

Moreover, we shall easily observe that the Athena they so admire has reached such a point of pusillanimity as to make sudden changes of mind in one direction and then the other, with the result that she is ridiculed for this reason even on the tragic stage. For Euripides in the *Trojan Women* says she rushed off to Poseidon and said the following to him about the Trojans and Achaeans:

> I want to cheer the Trojans who were once my enemies,
> [391] and to inflict a bitter homeward return on the army of Achaeans.[158]

Then he says to her:

> Why do you thus jump to different habits at different times,
> And why do you show such excessive hatred and love to whomever it happens to be?[159]

And Athena responded to this:

> Don't you know that I and my temples have been violated?[160]

And to this Poseidon [responded]:

> I know: when Ajax dragged Cassandra [from your temple] by force.[161]

And the aggrieved goddess said to him:

> He suffered nothing from the Achaeans, nor did he hear anything from them.[162]

[158] Euripides, *Tr.* 65–66; these lines recount Athena's desire to avenge the rape of the Trojan Cassandra by the lesser Ajax during the Greek sack of Troy (Cassandra had been seeking asylum at the precinct of the virgin goddess Athena, who had otherwise given her support throughout the war only to the Greeks). The goddess ultimately shipwrecked Ajax and his Greek troops as they returned from the Trojan War. Cyril is apparently the only extant author of antiquity to cite these and the following lines of the *Trojan Women*.

[159] Euripides, *Tr.* 67–68. [160] Euripides, *Tr.* 69. [161] Euripides, *Tr.* 70. [162] Euripides, *Tr.* 71.

Consequently, if the one who violated Cassandra had suffered something grievous from the Greeks, Athena would not have been provoked against the whole army. If so, then how can [Julian] blame Phineas for checking the wrath directed against everyone by carrying out against one person a punishment entirely in keeping with the law?[163]

5.32 Nevertheless, you will say that everything on the stage was fabricated by the poets.[164] If so, then how can it be that the account of this story[165] is treated with respect both by the rest of the elite ranks and by those who are not poets?[166] In any case, let's leave the tales of Athena and [392]
that "bloodthirsty" "blight to mortals" and "rager" here.[167]

But what about the [goddess] who squandered the prosperity of Oeneus and brought every kind of evil upon the affairs, lands, and cities of the Aetolians and the Curetae, I mean the "arrow-pouring" sister of Apollo? Did she not take the trivial and banal fact that Oeneus did not sacrifice to her "the firstfruits of his threshing floor"[168] as a pretext for shattering, as it were, his entire hearth? And didn't [Apollo], who was of the same blood as her and equally prone to anger, "send an evil disease throughout the army"[169] when a priest was wronged at Troy by one of the sons of Atreus, and didn't a great many people die in agony?

If, therefore, someone should "imitate the gods"[170] of the Greeks, will that person be mild and civilized or quick-tempered and heaving with wrath? As for myself, I say that the latter is true. But if this is not so, let him come forward and teach us how someone eager to imitate the gods

[163] Cyril here offers a rhetorically striking and unparalleled comparison of Euripides' account of Athena's vengeance with the biblical episode about Phineas. The last line of the passage from Euripides quoted above implies that if the Achaeans, or Greeks, had punished Ajax for his impiety against the goddess, her wrath would have been assuaged and she would not have meted out a punishment against the entire army. Phineas, in contrast, did what the Greeks failed to do, punishing the impious person and thereby turning away divine wrath from the entire nation of Israel.

[164] On poetic license, see *c. Iul.* 2.25.22–29 with note. [165] Gk.: ἱστορίας.

[166] Literally, "those outside the stage" (τοῖς ἔξω σκηνῆς). It is unclear whether Cyril has any particular thinkers in mind when he references the elite ranks of the Greeks; cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.4.5, where the apologist was thinking of Plutarch and Porphyry, if not others. Cyril's framing of the issue is (structurally, if not verbally) reminiscent of Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 3.1, which likewise answered the potential response by readers that the poetic accounts were pure fiction, with the observation that pagan philosophers took these accounts seriously; for background, see Riedweg 1994, 11: 225–26, although Cyril does not here seem to have had in mind any of the earlier sources listed there on the relationship of the poets to truth.

[167] For these Homeric epithets, see the notes to *c. Iul.* 5.31.4–7 above. [168] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 9.534.

[169] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 1.10. The episode referred to here occurred at the very outset of the *Iliad* (and indeed is the catalyst for the entire plot of that epic poem), when the "wrath of Apollo" (*Il.* 1.75) was poured out against the Greeks because their chief commander, Agamemnon, refused to return the daughter of Chryses, Apollo's priest (named by Cyril in the next paragraph), after she had been taken captive in a war raid.

[170] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 36.6–15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.28.9–19).

of the Greeks, who are so terrifying and so extremely warlike, could move beyond rage and anger and have a mind that is calm and tranquil. And if Athena raged at the Argives, while Artemis was punishing Oeneus for
[393] being lax about sacrificing, and if a great many "pyres of the dead were burning"[171] among the Greeks because a maiden captured by the spear was not released from the tents of Agamemnon and "the [priestly] garlands"[172] were being dishonored along with [the priest] Chryses, then how can it follow that "those who were initiated into the mysteries of Beelphegor"[173] and grieved the God of the universe with their unholy mind, who had been caught with extreme folly in the net of apostasy by pleasures that lead to shameful and lecherous behavior – how does it follow that they should be allowed to do this with impunity instead of being justly convicted of committing the worst evils?

5.33 But Julian goes on to say,

Julian

Finally, observe from the following that God was not concerned only for the Hebrews, but, although he cares for all nations, he gave nothing excellent or great to the Hebrews, while to us he gave [gifts] that were greater by far and distinctive.[174]

The Egyptians too, on the one hand, in counting among their own number the names of not a few wise men, are able to say that they have had many in the succession of Hermes – I mean Hermes who sojourned three times in Egypt.[175] *The Chaldeans and Assyrians, on the other hand, have those who are*
[394] *in the succession of Ninus*[176] *and Belus*[177] *and the Greeks have myriads of those*

[171] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 1.52. [172] Cf. Homer, *Il.* 1.14. [173] Cf. Num 25:5.

[174] While the precise phrase "gift of the gods" does not occur here, for Julian's use of it later, see *c. Gal.* fr. 55.18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.16.32–33) with note.

[175] Julian refers here to Hermes Trismegistus, the putative author of the *Corpus Hermeticum*; Julian seems to connect his designation as Thrice-Greatest (Trismegistus) to his status as a three-time visitor to Egypt. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.41 with note.

[176] Cyril has already mentioned "Ninus the son of Arbelus" at *c. Iul.* 1.10.3; there is no other mention of Belus in *c. Iul.*, unless the reference at 1.10 to Arbelus is thought to be a lengthened form of Belus (after all, other authors could designate Ninus the "son of Belus," as, e.g., Herodotus 1.7; Julius Pollux, *Onomast.* 9.12, although Cyril otherwise seems only to make Ninus the "son of Arbelus," as at *c. Iul.* 1.10.3; 3.51.24, 28). With respect to the name "Ninus," the manuscripts of *c. Iul.* are not in agreement, with some reading Νίνου and others Ἄννου. Boulnois follows Neumann, who conjectured that the reading Ἄννου was a corruption for Ὠάννου ("Ouannes"), a Babylonian fish god who was known for his contributions to various fields of knowledge, something for which Ninus was not known.

[177] Belus was considered by some to be the mythical founder of Babylon or as the Babylonians' supreme god, who was associated by some Greek authors with Zeus (e.g., Herodotus 1.181; 3.158; Diodorus Siculus 2.8.7; 2.9.4; Cassius Dio 78.8.5; Philo Byblius at Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.10.26) or claimed to be a child of Poseidon and Libya (Diodorus Siculus 1.28.1).

who are in the succession from Chiron,[178] *since from him have come all those who are naturally experts in the mysteries and the theologians, an area in which the Hebrews think it worthwhile to venerate only their own traditions.*[179]

Cyril

Next, he mocks the blessed David and Samson, saying that they weren't at all the bravest in battle but were inferior by a long shot to the strength of the Greeks and Egyptians, and that the scope of their kingdom was limited to the borders of Judea alone.

5.34 Well then, I would once more love to inquire what sort of god he claims cared for the nations such that while the Hebrews had "*nothing* at all *excellent or great*," nevertheless the Greeks have the best and most exceptional gifts? Is it the one testified to by the all-wise Moses as the Craftsman of the universe, of heaven and earth, and quite simply all that has been called by him into existence, and the one who alone has [395] authority and rules over the universe, keeping creation under his feet and being worshipped by it? Or is it that one whom [Julian] and those who were the forefathers of his impiety, after having first posited "the Good" in their speech and contemplations as a first cause, name as a lower-ranking and "second" God, the one they call the "*Craftsman proximate to the world*"?[180]

Now then, if the God Julian is referring to is "*the one who has been proclaimed by* the all-wise *Moses*,"[181] how can he say that he gave nothing beneficial or most essential to the Hebrews, despite the fact that he "was made known" to them;[182] he made his own preeminence and glory manifest to them; he permitted them to share in the true vision of God; and he then established for them a legislator who was both older in time than the Greek sages and who, by incomparable differences, was as distinct from them in wisdom, understanding, and also virtue, as light is thought to be in relation to darkness, and who also defined the best laws of all for them, with the result that, were each of their deeds in fact to be perfectly attuned to the blameless state [prescribed therein], those living under the law would [396] easily be able to know the path that is the highest of all forms of bliss?

[178] Chiron was the mythical centaur famed for his wisdom and medical knowledge and as the sometime mentor of Achilles; see e.g., Homer, *Il.* 4.217–19; 11.828–32.

[179] *c. Gal.* fr. 37 Mas.; Wright 1923, 366–67. A similar listing of inspired persons from various nations was given by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 6.80).

[180] On the "proximate Craftsman," see *c. Gal.* fr. 18.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.7) with note; on the Neoplatonic hierarchy, see *c. Iul.* 2.48 with note.

[181] See *c. Gal.* fr. 28.3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46.5–6).

[182] Cf. Ezek 20:5.

Yet what indeed is better than these gifts and what do the gifts of the Greeks have that is equal to them? Is it not the case that among us there is one first principle over all things, one glory, and one lordship, beyond which there is absolutely nothing else? Is it not the case that every wicked and bad habit is condemned by the law's verdicts? Isn't that which is shameful shunned and isn't every form of virtue held in supreme and worthy admiration?

5.35 But as for the teachings of the Greeks,[183] let us learn from him what they comprise. There are so many gods among them, more than can be counted, who differ from one another in their intentions and judgments; each of them has obtained their own allotted domain, "governing the nations"[184] and educating[185] them with diverse laws, so that some people are seen to have no control over their rage and anger, they cling to murder with impunity, they seize and carry off others' property, and they throw lands and cities into disarray,[186] while other people are in the grip of wild and strange pleasures to such a degree that they are frequently stung [with desire] for their mother and sister and whet their appetites
[397] for their own daughters.[187] These are the wise lessons of the ethnarchs! It is to them that the task of ruling has been entrusted by that one among the Greeks who is the Craftsman "proximate to the world," to use their own words. Won't they therefore be found guilty of blaspheming the one whom they revere as God?

Furthermore, as to the question of whether there have been some among Egyptians or Greeks who obtained the noble appearance of worldly wisdom,[188] this has nothing to do with Christianity.[189] For the books of Moses are older,[190] possessing a philosophy which is the precise, most true, and unadulterated knowledge of both divine and human affairs.[191]

[183] Gk.: τὰ … Ἑλλήνων.

[184] Cyril here uses the language of Julian at *c. Gal.* fr. 21.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.12) and fr. 26.3 Mas. (at *c. Iul.* 4.40.5).

[185] Gk.: παιδαγωγοῦντες; for the "educational" role of the ethnarch gods, see *c. Iul.* 4.3.17.

[186] See *c. Iul.* 4.4–5 (responding to *c. Gal.* fr. 21 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.2]) for the ethnic stereotype of savagery and violence among the Germans, Celts, and Scythians.

[187] See *c. Iul.* 4.4 for the ethnic stereotype of Chaldean (= Persian) incest.

[188] See *c. Gal.* fr. 37.7–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.33.6–11), which had included the Chaldeans and Assyrians; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 21.21–23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.25–27), which had also included the Romans.

[189] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

[190] For Moses' antiquity, see *c. Iul.* 1.5–17.

[191] According to Aetius, *Plac.* 1.Proem.2 (= Chrysippus, fr. 35 SVF), the Stoics defined wisdom as "knowledge of things both divine and human" (see also Sextus Empiricus, *M.* 9.13 = Chrysippus, fr. 36 SVF). For broader adoption of this definition, especially among Platonists, see the GCS apparatus fontium.

And he should not behave like a drunken sot towards the generals or kings of the Hebrews if they fall behind others in force or strength in battles and war. For such matters were not a significant concern for them, but they used to oppose those who wanted to lay waste their country, defending it and seeking merely to preserve it, not aiming to lunge wildly towards the property of others. For indeed the law that came from God [398] through Moses had presided over them as a judge and administrator[192] of justice.

5.36 Moreover, because he actually thinks that God gave every kind of good thing to the herds of the Greeks but nothing at all to the Hebrews, Julian prides himself in the creative words of the philosophers[193] and says,

Julian

> *But did he give a starting point for a science or a philosophic learning to you? And what kind? In fact,*[194] *theoretical knowledge of celestial phenomena was perfected among the Greeks after the first observations were made among the barbarians in Babylon.*[195] *And theoretical knowledge of geometry, having taken its start from the land surveys in Egypt,*[196] *has grown to such a great magnitude [among the Greeks].*[197] *The [knowledge] of numbers, which began from Phoenician traders, eventually became a showpiece of knowledge among the Greeks.*[198] *In fact, along with music, which is likewise arithmetical, the Greeks* [399] *combined the three into one, having interwoven astronomy with geometry and adapted arithmetic to both;*[199] *and after recognizing the harmony inherent in them, they posited on this basis the measures for their own music, discovering an infallible agreement – or at least something extremely close to this – between the harmonic ratios and the sense of hearing.*[200]

[192] Gk.: πρύτανις. [193] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.45.21.

[194] This and the following two sentences were excerpted loosely and attributed to Cyril by Glycas, *Ann.* 2, 240.13–17 Bekker.

[195] Cf. Herodotus 2.109; Porphyry, *VP* 6; also, Ps-Plato, *Epin.* 986e9–987a6, where observation of the stars is said to have originated in "Egypt and Syria." For the general claim that the Greeks improved upon the discoveries or inventions of barbarian peoples, see Ps-Plato, *Epin.* 987d9–988a5; Celsus, at Origen, *Cels.* 1.2; Ps-Hippolytus, *Haer.* 1.2.2; Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 42.156b. For the complexities of Julian's thought on this topic, see Bouffartigue 1992, 658–69, especially 666–69; Johnson 2012a, 449–51.

[196] The Greek γεωμετρίαν means literally "measurement of the earth."

[197] Cf. Herodotus 2.108–09; Diodorus Siculus 1.69.5; 1.94.3; Clement, *Str.* 1.16.74.2; Porphyry, *VP* 6.

[198] Cf. Porphyry, *VP* 6.

[199] These three (or four) disciplines are frequently grouped in Greek literature (e.g., at Plato, *Leg.* 7.817e5–818a1; Alcinous, *Didasc.* 28.4), and an extended account of them is found in the *Introduction to Arithmetic* 1.1–4 by the Neopythagorean philosopher Nicomachus of Gerasa, which was a favorite text of Iamblichus and widely read among Neoplatonists. See also Porphyry, *VP* 6 which lists the same national origins of geometry, arithmetic, and astronomy.

[200] *c. Gal.* fr. 38 Mas.; Wright 1923, 368–69.

Cyril

5.37 Such, therefore, are the [ideas] he lifts aloft and admires. But I for one would say in reply that he completely ignores the factors that would make it reasonable and appropriate to admire those people who cultivate the best view and who are believed to have arrived at true well-being. For what renders a man enviable and admirable is not only of course a facility
[400] with words and elegance and rhythm in their articulation, so as to be able to speak well and be fastidious[201] about the profundity of pointless but nevertheless subtle ideas, to weave tapestries of words with precision, and furthermore to attempt to seek what transcends intellect and all the things that falsify even our own true knowledge that comes through the senses.[202] But the person who would be truly wise – and who would be called wise by us – is someone who abounds in a clear and unambiguous view of the God of all and has accurately understood so far as possible the qualities of God – at least, I mean, as far as it is attainable by humans – and who has also gathered together infallible knowledge related to every essential topic, with the result that he can be counted among those men who have attained the right of being exalted for their pursuit of virtue.

For why must I busy myself[203] with the subjects of geometry, harmonics, arithmetic, and the other fields of knowledge, which are the only things they think have value and which cause them to raise a supercilious eyebrow? Indeed, I would say that when it comes to orderly conduct and being blameless in one's habits and character, zeal and eagerness in such subjects are useless. For [through these] one will not become
[401] superior to censured pleasures, nor a despiser of superfluous wealth and empty opinion, nor free from the waves of anger,[204] nor far removed from the love of slander and envy, nor someone devoted to the practices conducive to self-control, nor, certainly, to all the other good qualities, which, when closely attached to someone, render them most especially renowned, more than anyone else, but render those in whom they are absent and not inwardly present worthy of no account.

For it is possible, yes, it is possible to see someone who is naturally clever[205] and endowed with well-turned speech, who is extremely

[201] Gk.: περιεργάζεσθαι.
[202] Cyril returns to the subject of eloquence and its frequent link to sophistry at *c. Iul.* 7.7.16–23.
[203] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[204] For the metaphor "waves of anger," cf. *c. Iul.* 5.29.19–20 above.
[205] Gk.: εὐφυᾶ. Cyril may be alluding to Julian's use of such terminology in *c. Gal.* fr. 55.10, 17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.16.23, 31), specifically εὐφυΐας and φύσεως … ἔχων εὖ.

talkative, well-versed in Attic,[206] and most skillfully equipped for eloquence, but is unholy in character and caught in the nooses of the most shameful desires. But the person who is truly wise and perfectly sensible would possess such a state not in bare words alone, nor would their ability to come up with creative little words and an invincible cleverness in perverted ideas be enough to attain a good reputation.[207] For while such a person is an artisan when it comes to words, he is certainly not yet good as well. [402]

5.38 Accordingly, geometry, astronomy, and other such fields of knowledge could not render the one trained in them reputable and worthy of emulation, but instead only the precise, subtle, and blameless knowledge of God can do so. And, indeed, the duty of zealously maintaining the good and of rejecting its opposite, these I would say are the boasts of the pure and faultless philosophy, while, in my view, the traditions of the Greeks are insipid, largely pointless, and cost a lot of sweat for nothing.

And perhaps you will refuse to believe our words, but your Plato, Your Excellency, will be called in for assistance, since he has written in the fifth [book] of the *Republic* as follows:

> [Glaucon:] Shall we set down as philosophers all these people, and others who are learned in such areas, even those learned in the insignificant arts? [Socrates:] Not at all, I said, but they are similar to philosophers. [Glaucon:] Who, he said, are the true philosophers? [Socrates:] Those, I said, who love the sight[208] of truth."[209] For there is no philosophy in geometry's having postulates and theorems nor in [403] music, at least when it is scholastic, nor in astronomy, stuffed as it is with natural, fluid, and merely plausible claims; rather it comes through

[206] Gk.: ἀττικουργῆ, a rather rare term, which seems to be attested for Menander's corpus (see Menander, fr. 1000), but otherwise only occurs in antiquity in Synesius (*Ep.* 54.4; 74.1) and Cyril (*c. Iul.* 7.7.23 and here) and is otherwise more at home in glossaries and lexica.

[207] At *c. Iul.* Dedic.5.4, Cyril had applied the phrase "invincible cleverness" to Julian himself.

[208] Gk.: φιλοθεάμονας.

[209] Plato, *R.* 5.475d8–e4; the quotation is clearly taken from Clement, *Str.* 1.19.93.3–4, since the following sentence is precisely that of Clement following his own original quotation of Plato, which Cyril mistakenly (?) imagines to be a continuation of the Plato passage (cf. Theodoret, *Affect.* 1.33, who does the same, but stops the quotation of Clement slightly earlier than Cyril does here; see "Cyril's Sources" in our Introduction). Cyril's mistake is not as absurd as one might at first suppose, since the following sentence by Clement is redolent of Platonic thought and language. We have indented the entire passage from Clement (with the Plato passage embedded within it), since this is what Cyril understood to be the passage he was quoting from his source, but we have placed quotation marks around the precise passage from Plato to indicate to our readers where it begins and ends. Cyril seems to have made a similar mistake when taking a passage of Plato from Eusebius at *c. Iul.* 8.21.24–25.

> "knowledge" of "the Good itself,"[210] "and truth,"[211] since these [disciplines], while being other than the Good,[212] are nonetheless paths as it were to the Good.[213]

Accordingly, the practice of philosophy does not consist in those insignificant arts that are mocked in the manner we have seen above, but rather in knowing the truth, that is, the being that truly exists which is none other than God. And indeed, even Julian's own gods have testified to the doctrines of the Hebrews on this very point. For when someone came to Pythia to the temple of Apollo to ask a question of the oracle, wanting to learn which of the nations was the wisest, they say that the daemon there uttered,

> Chaldeans alone have obtained wisdom, and Hebrews,
> reverencing God himself the self-begotten king.[214]

And Porphyry too mentions the Essenes in Judea and says the following about them:

> Due to such a regimen and training in truth and piety, there are
> [404] understandably many among them who even foreknow the future, since they have been brought up in sacred books, distinctive acts of purification, and the sayings of prophets. It is rare that they ever err in their prognostications.[215]

5.39 Now as for the so-called "cycle of studies" which causes Julian to boast and think highly of himself, we will find that those people who were most supercilious in their worldly wisdom dismissed them as being not beyond reproach or accusation, a fact that one can learn both from what they themselves have written on this topic as well as from the writings of others. For, to take one example, Xenophon the Athenian at one point says the following:

[210] The connection of philosophy with "the Good itself" goes back to Plato; see, e.g., *R.* 6.507a3, 507b5; 7.534c4 (or "the form of the Good" at e.g., 6.505a2, 508e2–3; 7.534c1).

[211] For the pairing "knowledge and truth," see e.g., Plato, *R.* 6.508e3–4, 509a6–7.

[212] For the claim that "knowledge and truth" are other than and owe their existence to the Good, see *R.* 6.508e3–5.

[213] For the role of hypotheses in geometry, as well as the methods of the other disciplines, in a person's ascent to the intelligible realm and ultimately the Good, see Plato, *R.* 6.510b4–511c2.

[214] An oracle in dactylic hexameters also cited in Porphyry, *Phil. Orac.*, fr. 324 Smith (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.10.4; *D.e.* 3.3.6) and Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 11.2 and 24.2 (without acknowledgement of the oracle's inclusion in Porphyry's treatise). Cyril's wording of the oracles most closely follows the latter, although the fact that he names Porphyry in the next sentence indicates his recognition of its citation within Porphyry as reported by Eusebius.

[215] Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.13.9, also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.3.21.

> No one ever saw Socrates do or heard him say anything impious or unholy. For he used to dialogue neither about the nature of the universe nor about the other subjects most [sophists] discuss, investigating the condition of what the sophists call the cosmos and the necessary factors that give rise to each of the heavenly phenomena; instead, he used to prove that those who thought about such things were fools.

And after other things:

> He used to be amazed that it was not obvious to them that it is impossible for humans to discover these things, since even those thinking most highly of their talk about such matters did not have the same views as each other, but conducted themselves towards each other like raving lunatics. For [405]
> among lunatics, there are some who do not fear what is terrifying while others fear what is not fearful […]. For when it comes to those who are anxious about the nature of the universe, some hold that it is only one thing, while others hold that it is infinite in number; and to some it seems that everything is always in motion, while to others it seems that nothing could ever have moved; and to some it seems that everything comes to be and passes away, while to others it seems that nothing could ever have come to be or pass away.[216]

But what would those who investigate celestial phenomena say in response, those who despite not knowing things on earth, nevertheless busy themselves[217] with things in heaven?[218] Wouldn't one congratulate Socrates for saying that in such attempts they are like "raving lunatics," thoughtlessly lunging towards superfluous little suppositions, standing at odds with each other, and making war upon each other's inventions?[219]

5.40 To take another example, Plato, in addition to declaring that interest in these things is superfluous and useless, continues this accusation in his *On the Soul*,[220] where he says,

[216] Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.11 and 1.1.13, also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.8.15–16, who likewise omits 1.1.12 and the phrase marked by an ellipsis in 1.1.13 and who also follows the Xenophon quotations with material from Plato's *Phaedo*. As Boulnois, SC 582, 560–61 n. 2 suggests, however, the larger passage of *Mem.* 1.1.11–16 is quoted, without abbreviation, for a different purpose later in Eusebius, at *P.e.* 15.62.1–6, which is closer to Cyril's own purpose here, namely to highlight the worthlessness of the sciences; cf. Theodoret's borrowing of this quotation from Eusebius at *Affect.* 4.27–29.

[217] Gk.: πολυπραγμονοῦντες; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[218] Cf. Plato, *Tht.* 174a4–8, where the anecdote is given of a Thracian woman who mocked Thales for falling into a well while gazing at the heavens and thus exhibiting a failure to know the things at his own feet.

[219] On the conflicting cosmological accounts of the Greeks, see Cyril's fuller discussion at *c. Iul.* 2.14–17.

[220] In antiquity, Plato's *Phaedo* was more commonly designated "On the Soul" than by the name of its primary speaker, Phaedo, who reported Socrates' last discussion before his death about the nature of the soul.

[406] In fact, dear Cebes, when I was young, I had an astonishing longing for the wisdom they call the investigation into nature; for it seemed to me to be splendid to know the causes of each thing, why each thing comes to be, why it passes away, and why it exists. And often I waffled back and forth[221] when investigating first […]: Are animals nourished at that time when heat and cold undergo a certain kind of putrefaction, as some used to say? And, is it blood that we think with or air or fire? Or is it none of these things, but is it rather the brain which produces sensations of hearing, seeing, and smell, and is it from these senses that memory and opinion would arise, and is it from memory and opinion becoming stable that knowledge thereby arises?[222] And further, when investigating the decomposition of these things and what happens in both heaven and earth, in the end I seemed to myself to be as naturally unsuited to this investigation as anything could be. And I shall give you a sufficient proof of this: for, as to what I so clearly knew beforehand, at least as it seemed to me and to others, I then became so extremely blinded by the investigation itself that I unlearned even what I thought I knew before.[223]

If, therefore, superfluous investigations and the desire to busy oneself[224] with topics that are subtle and lofty and utterly inaccessible to the human [407] intellect bring with them no benefit, but instead harm, blindness, and the inevitability of "unlearning even"[225] the things already stored in our mind, the one boasting against us ought to lower his brow. The knowledge of the truth is a divine lesson useful for living and this is what Moses announced in advance long ago. Nevertheless, the account of this knowledge has reached us in a more subtle and unmixed manner, since Christ the Savior of us all has illumined us, through whom and with whom be glory to God the Father with the Holy Spirit forever, Amen.[226]

[221] Literally, "changed myself up and down" (ἐμαυτὸν ἄνω καὶ κάτω μετέβαλον).
[222] Our translation of the last clause takes into account the punctuation of the OCT edition of the *Phd.*, which the GCS avoided (as likewise, the GCS of Eusebius, *P.e.*).
[223] Plato, *Phd.* 96a5–c7, cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.8.17–18; Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.12–13.
[224] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[225] This recalls the final line of the just-quoted passage from the *Phd.* (96c7).
[226] This doxology marks the conclusion of Cyril's first pentad of books; it parallels the doxologies at the end of the Dedication, book 8, and book 10.

Book 6

6.1 This is the right moment to state again the words of the [411]
God-breathed scripture. For it said: "Death and life are in the power of the tongue; those who control it will eat its fruits."[1] For, although it is possible for those who wish to think well to derive benefit from the goods of the tongue, provided that it were somehow to be attuned to orderliness and the duty of speaking words that would earn everyone's admiration for having used it best, [nonetheless] some redirect their own words towards what is inappropriate. Their perverse and wicked words have even reached such a point that they think nothing of those things that exceed the [412]
bounds of every vice, they let loose their wanton tongue against God, and they take up their weapons against the ineffable glory. The inevitable result of these actions will certainly be that they are convicted for the most extreme vices. One such person was His Excellency Julian: for, although he had a talented tongue and a not unremarkable eloquence, he denounced the holy scripture and acts defiantly against the multitude of saints – and this, very frequently – so that he may also be rebuked by the Holy Spirit: "Why do you, who are powerful in lawlessness, boast in wickedness? Your tongue has planned injustice all day long."[2] And again further on it states: "You loved all the words of your deluge, your treacherous tongue."[3] So much abuse, then, has he shouted against the book of the all-wise Moses. But behold, even now he adds to his prior allegations, speaking as follows:

Julian

> *Should I also name one by one the professions or the people: for instance, Plato, Socrates, Aristides, Cimon, Thales, Lycurgus, Agesilaus, Archidamus, or instead the class*[4] *of philosophers, of generals, of craftsmen, of legislators? For* [413]

[1] Prov 18:21. *c. Iul.* 6.1.1–3 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 860. [2] Ps 51(52):3–4a.
[3] Ps 51(52):6. [4] Gk.: γένος.

> *the most wicked and loathsome of our generals will be found to have treated the greatest wrongdoers more fairly than Moses treated those who had done nothing wrong.*[5]

Cyril

6.2 So, I suppose, he again takes issue with the fact that some of the Moabites paid the penalty[6] for secretly introducing[7] to the men of Israel female prostitutes[8] who with the beauty of their bodies trapped in licentiousness not a few of God's people, and, implicating them in charges of apostasy, prepared those who were deceived to "be initiated into Beelphegor."[9] Next, Julian claims that those daring these things did not err at all since he apparently deems impiety towards God to be insignificant and, for this reason, claims the hierophant Moses was cruel and harsh. For, as I said, he supposes that making some people apostatize from the God over all is an insignificant fault and not completely intolerable; but instead, he thinks it is morally superior to persuade people that they ought to be attached to the false worship of idols. Let him hear from us, therefore, that of those accustomed to do such things,

> […] not even the one whom a mother
> [414] bears as a child in her womb, may even he not escape […].[10]

For I say it is right[11] that those who have prepared a net of death for others ought to be destroyed entirely, root and branch, as one of those famed on the stage says,

> It isn't terrible for those who have done terrible things to suffer them.[12]

Or wouldn't it be a truly most grievous and intolerable thing to act in a drunken and reckless manner against the divine glory[13] and cause

[5] *c. Gal.* fr. 39 Mas.; Wright 1923, 368–69.
[6] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 33 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.13), which obliquely refers to a Moabite woman (Cyril more explicitly refers to "women of Moab" at *c. Iul.* 5.18.7).
[7] Gk.: ὑφέντος, a term that was used in animal husbandry either for mating animals or for putting the young to suck (LSJ s.v. A.2); alternatively, the term could be used to refer to snakes "lurking" or any insidious activity (LSJ s.v. A.3).
[8] For Cyril's invocation of prostitutes as analogous to the sophistries of Julian, see *c. Iul.* 4.1.9–11; 7.9.1–4 (where similar language to what we find here is used).
[9] Cf. Num 25:1–5, discussed above at *c. Iul.* 5.13–23. Note that, in a departure from his usual pattern, Cyril has begun his response to the preceding fragment of Julian by commenting on the last topic that appears in it, Moses' fairness as a judge.
[10] Homer, *Il.* 6.58–59; these lines were rarely cited in antiquity and never by a Christian author.
[11] Literally, "holy" (ὅσιον).
[12] Euripides, *Or.* 413. These lines were rarely cited in antiquity and never by a Christian author.
[13] Cyril adopts the metaphor of inebriation again at *c. Iul.* 6.8.49–50.

considerable offense to the ineffable nature, insofar as their attempts could even do this? How, then, can this be disputed?

6.3 Furthermore, since he holds in great admiration those of the ancients who were like-minded to himself and dares to compare them with the saints, come, let us for our part say what is reasonable, pitting the truth against his slanders. For though he supposes those whom he admires to be better than those on our side, he is deprived of the truth and has gone far astray from his purpose.[14]

Come now, even before the others, let's see what sort of person their far-famed Socrates was. For he has been admired for worldly wisdom and they say he was one of the most eloquent of men, but in terms of his habits and morals one can observe that he was no better than those who have wasted life among the common herd and vagabonds.[15] Even if every single person should perhaps disbelieve the accounts about him, never- [415]
theless they will not likewise dispute the writings of Porphyry who sketched out the life of each of the ancients.[16] In fact, this was his aim[17] and he deemed it a matter worthy of much seriousness. Accordingly, he said the following about him:

> Aristoxenus, in narrating the life of Socrates,[18] says he had heard the anecdotes about him from Spintharus,[19] who was one of those who met him. [Aristoxenus reports] that he said that he himself had not met with many people more persuasive [than Socrates], and that such[20] was his voice, his speech, his outward bearing, and in addition to everything just mentioned

[14] For the claim that Julian misses the mark or fails in his aim (σκοποῦ), see *c. Iul.* 2.35.4 with note.

[15] Cyril may intentionally be adopting Platonic language in which the speaker Socrates rejects the opinions and practices of the many, designating them as a herd or falling under the sway of vagabonds (in particular wandering, begging diviners); see Plato, *Plt.* 268a and *R.* 2.364b, respectively.

[16] Cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.23.13, who similarly mentioned Porphyry's unflattering depiction of Socrates in his *Philosophical History* but disagreed with the negative portrait of him there. Given his apparent familiarity with Cyril's *c. Iul.* elsewhere (cf. *c. Iul.* 3.29.16–18 with note), Socrates may have been relying on these passages from Porphyry quoted by Cyril in the following section.

[17] Gk.: σκοπός.

[18] Cf. Diogenes Laertius 2.20.8 (= Aristoxenus fr. 59.1–2 Wehrli). Aristoxenus was a student of Aristotle whose most significant contributions seem to have been in the areas of philosophical biography and music theory; he was particularly hostile to Socrates and Plato. See Huffman 2012 (as well as other essays in the same volume); briefly, see also Segonds, in Segonds and des Places 2019, 183 n. 2 and 186 n. 1.

[19] The quotation could be playing with alliteration and puns, e.g., Spintharus, "Sparky," describes Socrates being "fired up" with anger. At the same time, the Suda entry on Aristoxenus reports that Spintharus was the nickname for Aristoxenus' own father Mnesius (although without providing reasons): υἱὸς Μνησίου, τοῦ καὶ Σπινθάρου; (Suda, s.v. Ἀριστόξενος, = fr. 1 Wehrli). On Spintharus, see Woodbury 1973, 20–21.

[20] After closely paraphrasing the previous clause, Theodoret begins quoting from here to the end of this fragment at *Affect.* 12.62–63.

> his distinctive appearance. [Aristoxenus says] this is more or less what he was like when he was not angry; but whenever he would flare up with this passion, his shameful manner was terrible, for there wasn't anything he wouldn't say or do.[21]

6.4 Well then, what is more disgraceful than anger? Or wouldn't uncontrolled anger, an untamable impulse, and terrible bitterness be the worst mental illness[22] to have? For when a furious wind beats down,[23] the sea does not rage and break upon both land and rocks with the waves' unbearable onslaughts as much as the soul of a man suffering bad temper and
[416] unbridled anger. The divine scripture, therefore, also exhorts us with the following words: "Cease from rage, and put aside anger."[24] For "rage destroys even sensible people."[25] And, indeed, [it says] that, "A man of anger lacks decorum."[26] From what reckless acts will such a man abstain? Will he not give free rein to his tongue and instead violently deride with imprudent words even those very ones perhaps who have done him no wrong? For in the very manner, I suppose, that a rock hurtles downhill with uncontrollable momentum over everything which falls in its path and is carried wherever it happens to go, likewise in the same way, I think, if someone should be brash and bitter and tyrannized by a beastly temper, he will not only spare neither word nor deed, perchance, but will also let loose his own tongue's lack of restraint and the onslaught of his raging deeds even against God just as he would every human. Where, therefore, shall we place Socrates, sick as he was with this most shameful of all the vices?

In contrast, the inspired "Moses" was most "exceedingly," exceedingly gentle "compared to all persons";[27] for so it has been written about him. And at one point the Savior and Lord of the universe also spoke to us, "Learn from me, since I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls";[28] and indeed, he also said, "Blessed are the gentle, since they will inherit the earth."[29] And so, if they say that having
[417] a steadfast character and being adorned with the tranquility of gentleness, as well as possessing a well-practiced moderation with words are more valuable than anything, let us with all justice indict Socrates, since he failed miserably in both areas. But if someone praises bad temper and a wanton tongue, then he has disparaged gentleness and he not only

[21] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 211 Smith. [22] Gk.: ἀρρώστημα νοῦ.
[23] For identical language, see Cyril, *Is.* 17:12–13 (PG 70.433c); *c. Iul.* fr. 69. The issue of anger is also treated in *c. Iul.* fr. 70.
[24] Ps 36(37):8a. [25] Prov 15:1a. [26] Prov 11:25b.
[27] Cf. Num 12:3; while the doubling of "exceedingly" occurs in the LXX at Gen 17:6; 30:43; Exod 1:7 and 12.
[28] Matt 11:29. [29] Matt 5:5.

blames that which is full of praise, but also has awarded the winning verdict to what is more shameful. Such a man would quite reasonably be ridiculed.

6.5 So then, Socrates was sick with a piercing anger, but will we find him free of the other [vices] that would plunge him into extreme disrepute? Not at all. For he was so girl-crazy and so wholeheartedly captured by tendencies[30] towards it that he thought there was nothing better. Indeed, Porphyry has again written about him as follows:

> In his way of life, he was otherwise easily satisfied and needed little provision for ephemeral things, but,[31] in the area of lovemaking, he was rather excessive – although not to the point of wrongdoing, since he made love only to his wives and common women.[32] He had two wives[33] at the same time: Xanthippe was a citizen and in some ways rather common, while Myrto was the granddaughter of Aristides the son of Lysimachus. Also, while Xanthippe fell into his embraces in secret[34] and from her Lamprocles was born to him, Myrto did so in marriage and from her Sophroniscus and Menexenus were born to him.[35]

What, then, would the admirer of Socrates say to this? For, as they themselves say, he was not only "rather excessive" in lovemaking, but was also [418] caught in the very act as a very lascivious, uncontrolled person, insatiable in such immensely loathsome pleasures; at any rate, although both wives were joined to him in wedlock – and even this was arguably not in proper order – he used to fall into the embraces[36] of other women as well, shameful women, that is, and girls for hire, who offered the beauty of their bodies for sale to lovers. And yet how could these things not be foreign to the philosophical way of life and practical virtue? Well then, did he censure the young if they ever chose to live contrary to reason? If

[30] Gk.: ταῖς … ῥοπαῖς.

[31] Theodoret quotes this fragment from this point to the end of the passage at *Affect.* 12.64.

[32] The phrase "common women" (ταῖς κοιναῖς … μόναις) was a euphemism for prostitutes; LSJ, s.v. IV.3.c.

[33] The Greek γυναῖκας could mean either "women" or "wives," either of which could be the sense here. We have opted for the latter under the consideration that Porphyry's primary source in this passage, most likely Aristoxenus, was almost certainly enhancing a negative depiction of Socrates' sex life that was in its fledgling stages at the time he wrote and that imputed the practice of bigamy onto Socrates; for a thorough discussion, see Woodbury 1973.

[34] See Woodbury 1973, 21–22 on the textual issues of this phrase.

[35] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 215 Smith; the quotation is given in *oratio obliqua* (although it may be that Cyril is directly quoting Porphyry's own use of one of his sources, probably Aristoxenus, in *oratio obliqua*). Cf. the use of *oratio obliqua* to report Aristoxenus' words in *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 211 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 6.3.16–24).

[36] Literally, "interweaving oneself together with" (συνεπλέκετο) a woman; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.19.7; 6.7.3; 7.11.25; 7.14.6.

so, what appeal of any weight could he have made to them, when it is readily clear that he not only was caught in such utterly foul enterprises when he was decked with white hair but already had a mind that was also tyrannized by them?[37] I learned from the writing of Plato somewhere that one of his friends said to him: "Where have you come from, Socrates? Surely not from hunting the youthful beauty of Alcibiades?"[38] Well then, that is all I want to say about the affairs of Socrates.

6.6 But let's now look into[39] the [morals] of Plato[40] himself and see if he hasn't likewise admired those of Socrates and whether his very own words don't convict him of having suffered the same lack of restraint towards desires as him. For on the one hand, in the *Philebus* he says,

> Pleasure is the most pretentious thing of all, as they say, and with respect to the pleasures of lovemaking, which are thought to be the greatest, even perjury has received pardon from the gods, since pleasures are like children
[419] in the fact that they have not acquired the least bit of sense.[41]

And, on the other hand, in the *Symposium* he says,

> What is most astounding, as the many say, is that the gods pardon a [lover] if he has broken even an oath which he has sworn. For the vow of one in love is, they say, not a vow. So much have both gods and men made every allowance for the lover.[42]

It is therefore with good reason that he is ashamed and embarrassed at his own words, claiming that they belong to others,[43] but how can one doubt that he praises this thing? For he never once censures those who have chosen to think like this. O the learning of philosophers! How truly great is the benefit it contains as it keeps the licentious pleasures from young people and persuades them to live the self-controlled and noble life. Surely, if they really came to think that gods also pardon lovers, even if they were somehow to become unjust and uncontrolled lovers of either women or boys, then they would entirely and in every way be granted allowance likewise to swear falsely with impunity, if they should want to

[37] Cf. *c. Iul.* 7.13 where Cyril explains Solomon's moral failing as partly due to his old age.
[38] Plato, *Prt.* 309a1–2 (slightly altered, as though Cyril may be quoting from memory, since it is after all the very first lines of the dialogue); cited rarely in antiquity and never by a Christian author.
[39] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[40] In now turning from Socrates to Plato, Cyril is following the list (albeit in part and not in the same order) of great men referenced by Julian in the preceding fragment; see *c. Gal.* fr. 39.3–4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.1.25).
[41] Plato, *Phlb.* 65c5–d2; cited rarely in antiquity, but also by Eusebius, *P.e.* 14.22.2.
[42] Plato, *Smp.* 183b5–c2; cited by no other extant author in antiquity, except for Stobaeus (*Anth.* 4.20a.30).
[43] i.e., Cyril highlights the "as they say" phrase in each of the two passages quoted above.

do so. And furthermore, there would be no opportunity for piety towards God, when laxity goes unpunished. Accordingly, why ought one who has obtained so illustrious and famous a reputation for having the ability and the knowledge to practice philosophy cast aside the reverence towards the divine as less important than a shameful and reproachable pleasure?

6.7 And the one who raises such a lofty eyebrow in pride over all-virtuous[44] Cimon[45] should surely take another look at what sort of person he was in his habits. For he fell into the nuptial embraces[46] of Elpinike, who was of the same blood and seed as him, and shared his sister's bed in imitation of Persian custom or rather Zeus the Highest himself.[47] And when Cleon issued him an indictment for tyranny, he stood trial for this at Athens and was convicted, paying the penalty set forth by the laws.[48] Theopompus writes about him that he was a most thievish person and more than once exposed as succumbing to shameful profit; learning how to be corrupt apparently insinuated itself among the Athenian generals following his lead.[49] And yet how would it not be all-shameful[50] and perhaps the ultimate disease among vices to have a weakness for unjust gain and to be such a money-lover, to be incited to nuptials with one's sister, and to come a close second to barbaric insanity so as even to wrong the very laws of nature? [420]

Moreover, Aristides,[51] for his part, having been openly convicted of embezzling money, was forced to pay the penalty. He was so bitter and envious and raving mad for the accolades of others that when he was asked one time by the Athenians how they might best be governed and how the affairs in the city might proceed with a fair wind,[52] he said that this could not happen in any other way unless they cast him together

[44] This compound adjective is to be contrasted with Cimon's "all-shameful" behavior in the last sentence of this paragraph.

[45] For Julian's mention of Cimon, see *c. Gal.* fr. 39.3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.1.25).

[46] Literally, "interweaving oneself together with" (συνεπλέκετο) a woman; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.19.7; 6.5.20; 7.11.25; 7.14.6.

[47] Cf. Diodorus Siculus 10.31; Plutarch, *Cim.* 4.6; 15.4; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 13.56. For the ethnic stereotype of Persian incest (and the denial of it among the Athenians), see *c. Gal.* fr. 24.12–14 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.33.11–12) with note. On Zeus's incest, see *c. Gal.* fr. 4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.11).

[48] The GCS apparatus notes that no other ancient source mentions Cimon's trial and conviction for tyranny.

[49] This passage = Theopompus, *Hist.* FGrHist 115 F 90. Cyril appears to be the only author to cite Theopompus (a fourth-century continuator of Thucydides) as a negative source on Cimon; in fact, F 89 even highlights his generosity, not his thievishness.

[50] As noted above, this compound adjective matches the introduction of "all-virtuous" Cimon at the beginning of this paragraph.

[51] Julian had named Aristides in his list of great men in the preceding fragment; see *c. Gal.* fr. 39.3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.1.25).

[52] For the metaphor of "affairs proceeding (or being carried) with a fair wind" (which is also very common in John Chrysostom), see also, e.g., *Ep. Fest.* 11.5.72; 12.2.5; and variously elsewhere.

with Themistocles into a pit.[53] Themistocles presumably used to cause him grief because he was excellent at naval battles and won a better reputation for his generalship.

6.8 Although it is possible to say a great many true things also about the others,[54] I am omitting this material for the moment. But instead, I shall turn towards the necessary discussion of the manly deeds of the
[421] saints. Who of their own men could he claim was equal to the most excellent Moses? Indeed, even the Greek history-writers have testified that he was the first of legislators and was held, moreover, in great admiration. Furthermore, from the God-breathed scripture anyone might see the other aspects of this man's excellence: when God apportioned power to him, he turned the Egyptians' rivers into blood, caused damage to the inhabitants by unbearable hail and a long and deep darkness, and he delivered his kinsmen from the greedy clutches of Pharaoh as they crossed through the middle of the sea. And after him Joshua, upon being proclaimed commander and receiving the generalship, shone forth with equally manly deeds. For he restrained the Jordan from its onrush as it hurtled in unrestrained torrents of water and he transported the sons of Israel across, arguably with their feet still dry. Sending up a prayer to God, who holds sovereignty over the universe, he stopped the course of
[422] the sun and moon. Although I could add a great many more things worth hearing to what I have said, I am omitting them for the moment.

But I shall make use of the words of the blessed Paul. For, in writing to the Hebrews, he says the following at one point: "[I do not have time to give a narrative] about Gideon, Samson, Barak, Jephthah, David, and Samuel, and the prophets who by faith contended against kingdoms, practiced justice, attained the promises, shut the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were empowered out of weakness, were made strong in battle, and turned aside foreign hosts. Women received their own dead by resurrection."[55] And in addition to this: "They went about in sheepskins and goatskins, destitute, crushed, abused, people

[53] Cf. Plutarch, *Arist.* 3.2.

[54] Of Julian's original list of Plato, Socrates, Aristides, Cimon, Thales, Lycurgus, Agesilaus, and Archidamus (fr. 39.3–4, quoted at *c. Iul.* 6.1.25–26), only the characters of the first four have received treatment in Cyril's response so far. Thales is briefly mentioned in earlier books at *c. Iul.* 1.14.13–15; 1.18.14–17; 1.38.11 (in a quotation from Porphyry); 1.38.18–19; 1.40.16–17; 2.14.13–14 (in a quotation from Ps-Plutarch); Lycurgus (together with Solon) is invoked for a sustained section of argument at 5.25–27 and receives brief discussion at *c. Iul.* 1.13.19–21; 5.4.13–15, 22–23. Agesilaus (probably Agesilaus II, the king of Sparta, c. 400–c. 360 BC) and Archidamus (probably Archidamus II, the king of Sparta, c. 469–c. 427, who was responsible for invading Attica in the first years of the Peloponnesian War) are never discussed by Cyril in the surviving portions of *c. Iul.*

[55] Heb 11:32–35.

whom the world did not deserve, wandering in deserted places, mountains, caves, and holes in the ground."[56] Tell me then, what is of greater renown than these deeds? What rivals the brilliance that arises from their virtues? "The world did not deserve" them; conquered by the superiority of their manly deeds, it yields the preeminence to them. Moreover, "the world" in this passage should be understood as those in the world.[57]

Furthermore, since Julian says the "*most loathsome of generals*" among the Greeks "*treated the greatest wrongdoers more fairly than Moses treated those who had done nothing wrong*," let him hear also from us: "Your Excellency, you are completely disregarding the crime of impiety against God. It seems to you an insignificant thing, as I said, to walk away from [423] service under him and to dishonor the yoke of his rule, and to choose instead to be willingly yoked to unclean spirits as though it were something better." If, however, he himself and the apostates with him had not been caught up in such crimes, he would have deemed the matter to be something truly grievous and worthy of the worst punishment of all. But, since he has fallen into the devil's trap and has dishonored the ineffable glory of God, he thought perhaps that he could absolve his own actions along with the others by saying that those who had acted in a drunken[58] and unholy manner against his divine glory had done no wrong.[59]

6.9 Yet it seemed right to the laws of the Greeks that one ought neither to introduce other gods besides those that existed and were recognized, nor indeed to say anything shameful and discordant about them, and they used to think they were being pious in threatening those who habitually did so with actual punishment in blood and not a mere monetary fine.[60] For example, when Anaxagoras said the sun's globe was a fiery rock,[61] the judges at Athens condemned him to death.[62] And they brought an indictment for impiety against Diagoras when he

[56] Heb 11:37b–38.

[57] It is not entirely clear why Cyril feels the need to add this last remark that "the world" of the biblical passage is the people in the world, not, apparently, the sphere of natural reality. Perhaps he was keen to avoid a denigration of the physical world, warding off the possibility that one might think these saints had no need of their bodies or physical matter due to their superior moral state. For a similar discussion of what "the world" refers to in the Bible, see *c. Iul.* fr. 77.

[58] For the metaphor, cf. *c. Iul.* 6.2.22.

[59] On Julian's apostasy, cf. *c. Iul.* Dedic.4 with note.

[60] Cf. *Glaph. Gen.* 5 (PG 69.280d), where Cyril exhorts his Christian readers not to demand "blood" or a "savage penalty" from those who lead Christians into apostasy. On Cyril's view of religious violence, see Crawford 2023b.

[61] Cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.7.6–10; Ps-Hippolytus, *Haer.* 1.8.6.

[62] The condemnations of Anaxagoras and Diagoras are briefly mentioned at Josephus, *Ap.* 2.265–66; there is insufficient verbal similarity between Josephus and Cyril to affirm with confidence a dependency of the latter upon the former – and yet it is also difficult to find any other passage in ancient literature that pairs these two in a similar way.

wrote[63] about the gods things deemed to be wrong by those who heard them. He was also nearly killed, except that he anticipated them and went away to others after leaving the land of the Greeks. And indeed, they also say that the overseers of sacred laws once got so angry at Diagoras of Melos himself when he mocked their initiations, festivals, and mysteries that they even settled on a talent of silver as a kind of prize for those who killed him. And I pass over the fact that Socrates said a spiritual being[64] gave certain oracles to him and that he swore by an oak
[424] and by a dog,[65] and for this reason, as I also said earlier,[66] he was convicted by the indictments of his accusers. And so, the Greeks paid so much attention to the issue of falsely called gods that they even let loose their undiluted anger against the sages themselves and sharpened, so to speak, all their laws against them. But yet you accuse Moses and claim that he was hardhearted in his chastisement of the multitude, which was beyond number, since he permitted a few to suffer who had completely neglected reverence towards the divine and were "initiated into Beelphegor."[67] And yet shouldn't he instead have been crowned with the utmost accolades as pious and God-loving?

6.10 But Julian did not do this – and what is the reason? While slandering the generals, or rather kings, of the Hebrews, he speaks in the following way:

Julian

> *Which [Greek] kingdom, therefore, shall I cite for you? That of Perseus or that of Aeacus or Minos of Crete, who cleared the sea of pirates, expelling and driving out the barbarians as far as Syria and Sicily, extending the borders of his empire on each side, and who used to control not only the islands but the coastlands as well?*[68] *And, after dividing with his brother Rhadamanthys not the land but the care of humanity, he himself set up laws, receiving them from*
> [425] *Zeus, while he left it to Rhadamanthys to fulfill the role of a judge.*[69]

[63] There seems to be a pun in the Greek here: they brought an indictment (γραφήν) because Diagoras wrote (γεγραφότι).
[64] Gk.: τὸ δαιμόνιον.
[65] While Socrates can nowhere be found swearing "by the oak" (although he uses the phrase "from oak and rock" more than once, drawing upon Homer, *Od.* 19.163; cf. *Il.* 22.126; see Plato, *Ap.* 34d5; *Phdr.* 275b6, 8; *R.* 8.544d7–8), he does swear "by the dog" at, e.g., *Ap.* 22a1; *Phd.* 98e5; and elsewhere.
[66] See *c. Iul.* 5.27.16–19.
[67] Cf. Num 25:3 and 5, alluded to at *c. Iul.* 6.2.5–6 and given fuller discussion at *c. Iul.* 5.13–23.
[68] On Minos' clearing the sea of pirates and extending his naval empire, see Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.4.
[69] *c. Gal.* fr. 40 Mas.; Wright 1923, 368–71. Cf. Plato (?), *Min.* 320c; Plutarch, *Thes.* 16.4.

Cyril

Now then, I already said[70] that those who at times ruled over the people of Israel, because they had quite rightly been made wise by the decrees of Moses and were admirably trained in every form of justice, did not wish to go and carry off what belonged to other people, nor indeed did they arm themselves against neighboring or distant cities and lands,[71] but, preserving their own land and defending that which bore them, they preferred to stay at home and this was a prayer come true for them. In contrast, Your Excellency, your Minos, despite receiving "*the laws*" as you said "*from Zeus*," was not content with only directing the affairs of the Cretans with whose rule he had been invested, but was so excited[72] to get a bigger share and mad for things that in no way belonged to him that he not only seized the islands by the law of war and led free people away as captives won by the spear, but even against those furthest away he let loose the onslaught of his own inherent perversity, which circumstances and experience itself showed to be unholy. Homer, for example, says he was "destructive-minded." He states,

> For [Odysseus] saw Phaedra and Procne, and fair Ariadne,
> daughter of destructive-minded Minos.[73]

And Callimachus [says],

> Minos stretched a heavy yoke over the neck of the islands.[74] [426]

Yet if, in fact, it was truly just that the duty of ruling belonged to him, the best of poets would not have called him "destructive-minded," nor would he have been criticized for laying upon the islands the burdensome and unbearable "yoke" of his own greediness. But enough about these matters. Now as to his domestic affairs, wouldn't it be worth looking at how they were conducted? For his wife was Pasiphae and his daughters were Phaedra and Ariadne. His wife, for her part, was sick with a desire for what was unnatural and is said to have had intercourse with a bull and to have birthed something monstrous. His daughters meanwhile fill the tragic stages, brought into disrepute for their licentiousness.[75]

[70] See *c. Iul.* 5.35.20–27.
[71] Cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 3.10; 4.6; 4.15, for critical notes on imperial aggrandizement.
[72] The Greek offers a wordplay that is impossible to replicate in English between "invested" (ἀνῆπτο) in the earlier clause and "excited" (ἀνεπτόητο) here.
[73] Homer, *Od.* 11.321–22; aside from its quotation by Porphyry, *ad Od.*, *ad loc.*, these lines seem to be cited by no other author before Cyril.
[74] Callimachus, *Aet.* I, fr. 4; not cited by any other author in antiquity.
[75] Possibly an allusion to Euripides' *Hippolytus*, which presented Phaedra's mad love for her stepson, Hippolytus.

6.11 Let's pass over the accounts of Perseus since they possess mythic elements, are full of nonsense, and have an excess of falsehood. But, after his discussion about Minos, Julian heads out into the wide sea of narrative and makes mention of Greek historical accounts, claiming that Dardanus was born from Zeus and Electra, the daughter of Atlas, and that furthermore he became the founder of Dardania and even ruled with Zeus when he was dead, and he mentions certain other things as well that are full of nonsense and babbling. Having in the midst of this discussion also mentioned Christ the Savior of us all, he again lifts "the
[427] horn" of his ignorance "aloft"[76] and speaks about him:

Julian

> *But the name of Jesus, who persuaded the worst element among us, has been known for little more than three hundred years, and during the time when he was living he performed no deed worthy of mention, unless someone thinks it is a great achievement to heal the deformed and blind and to exorcize the daemon-possessed in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany.*[77]

Cyril

6.12 So about Dardanus he was able to say nothing noble or worthy of memory, although he could have made up stories and considers doing so tantamount to an illustrious and manly accomplishment. But nonetheless, when he says that a "*few*" have been ensnared by Christ the Savior of us all,[78] he belittles the inhabited world and considers those throughout all the earth to be easily numbered. Where then will we ever find the many if everyone is a "*few*"? And, those who accept the word of the Gospels have not been deceived, but rather are shaking free of the deception of the Greeks and shifting anchorage to the truth, as the facts themselves will shout out if we ourselves should be silent. And when he dares,

[76] Cf. Ps 74(75):6 (also cited at *c. Iul.* 5.24.24).

[77] *c. Gal.* fr. 41 Mas.; Wright 1923, 376–77. For a similar enumeration of Jesus' activity of healing and exorcism, see Matt 15:30–31. Although well-attested in the evangelists as places of visitation or residence, this precise enumeration of miraculous activity is not otherwise ascribed to any visit to Bethsaida or Bethany (but for healing in the area, cf., e.g., Mark 6:45, 56 and 8:22–26; John 11:1–44). Bethsaida otherwise came in for special cursing (cf. Matt 11:21; Luke 10:13). It is most likely that Julian includes reference to them here merely to highlight the rusticity and obscurity of locations central to the rise of the religion of the "Galileans" (= Christians).

[78] Cyril takes the "little" of Julian's text (ὀλίγους; fr. 41.7 [= *c. Iul.* 6.11.12]) to refer to a "few" people (i.e., "Jesus persuaded the worst element among us, only a few"), whereas Julian had clearly meant it to designate years. Cf. the use of the same construction at *c. Gal.* fr. 49 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.37.19–20).

at any rate, to disparage the signs from God, namely those performed by Christ, Julian does not know how to admire what surely ought to be admired. For how else was he to be recognized as God even when he [428] became a human, having remained what he was? Was it by unfurling[79] this exceedingly great and boundless heaven and by ordaining that a land, different from the present one,[80] emerge out of the waters for us? Was it by creating something new in the realm of the sun, moon, and other stars? No, this was not his aim[81] in the incarnation: rather he pitied humanity since it had been reduced to extreme wretchedness by the tricks of daemons and was utterly ignorant of the identity of the one who is by nature truly God and the Craftsman of the universe, and since it had instead been carried off towards an ignorant and corrupt frame of mind because of their choice actually to worship "the creation instead of the Creator"[82] and to attach their veneration to "things made of wood and stone."[83] Therefore, in order that they might shift their mind towards the duty of knowing the truth, Christ appeared in a form like ours, declaring that he himself was the Son of the one who constructed this whole universe through him.

6.13 Since the miraculous nearly always tends to draw us to faith,[84] he used to heal those with sicknesses and send light into the blind and he would order unclean daemons to cast themselves into the recesses of the abyss and they had to fulfil his command, and so he would free those bullied by them. He used to command the seas and winds to be calm at his rebuke, and the creation was not unaware of the authority belonging to the one who gave such orders. He used to call the dead from tombs, although they already smelled and were decomposing; with the most [429] God-befitting nod of his head, he would grant the ability to regain life.[85] What, tell me, is more spectacular than these miracles? What is of such a grand nature? If, therefore, this wonder-working was a demonstration of medical expertise, then Julian need not in fact consider it venerable and his lack of admiration is excusable.[86] But, on the contrary, since it possesses a clear proof of a power that is most supremely appropriate to the divine, how is what I said not true? In fact, he fails to practice and wholeheartedly pursue, it seems, the duty of marveling at things that surely ought to deserve all consideration.

[79] Cf. Isa 34:4; Rev 6:14. [80] Cf. *Ep. Fest.* 28.4 (PG 77.953a); Heb 11:13–16. [81] Gk.: σκοπός.
[82] Rom 1:25. [83] Deut 4:28; 28:64. [84] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 19.
[85] For similar phrasing, see *c. Iul.* 7.8.17–18.
[86] The mention of "medical expertise" in this sentence is perhaps a forecasting of the argument about Asclepius that will occur at *c. Iul.* 6.22–24.

And yet, dear sir, we shall find that your highest Zeus and those others with him that you actually call gods are unable to snatch from the nooses of death the people who have been caught in them.[87] The best of poets confirms our point, too, when he says,

> But in truth the gods are unable to ward off death, as it comes for all alike,
> even from a man who is dear, whenever
> the devastating fate of grievous death should take him.[88]

6.14 Having completed his empty recitation[89] on Dardanus as it pleased him, he proceeds immediately to the flight of Aeneas and offers a clear narrative of his departure from Troy towards the nations of Italians, and furthermore makes mention of both Romus[90] and Romulus and of how Rome was founded. And stretching out his words at length for this purpose, he says the most wise Numa was given to them by Zeus and
[430] indeed, he also says about him,

Julian

> *But when Rome was beset by many wars after its foundation, yet kept conquering and prevailing over all and needed greater security as it grew ever greater in proportion to those very dangers, Zeus in turn set the most philosophical Numa over it. This was the noble and good Numa who spent his time in deserted groves and was always communing with the gods in his pure thoughts.*

And after other things:

> *He is the one who established most of the priestly laws.*[91]

Cyril

Since therefore, to use his own words, Numa was "*noble and good*" and with "*pure thoughts*" "*established most of the priestly laws*," we should for a moment investigate[92] what sort of character his worship had. Accordingly, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who has composed very fine

[87] For similar phrasing, see *c. Iul.* 6.16.12; 7.8.17.
[88] Homer, *Od.* 3.236–8; aside from an allusion in an earlier grammarian, no other ancient author quotes these lines. Cyril cites more Homeric lines to make a similar criticism of the Greek gods at *c. Iul.* 2.4.1–18; 10.15.24–53.
[89] Gk.: ῥαψῳδημα.
[90] Romus is a not uncommon spelling for Remus in Greek authors of the imperial period; cf. *c. Iul.* 1.14.6.
[91] *c. Gal.* fr. 42 Mas.; Wright 1923, 370–71.
[92] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

histories of the Romans, has recorded about him that, although he built sanctuaries and temples, there was nonetheless no image in them.[93] For, since he thought it right to praise Pythagoras' philosophy and was completely given to his teachings,[94] he supposed the divine to be formless and entirely without shape, and he affirmed that it took pleasure in intelligible sacrifices, not material ones. And so, when he set up temples, he would name them temples of Faith, through which alone the divine is seen, insofar as it is even accessible to humans, and he enjoined upon his subjects to swear in their oaths by Faith.[95] But Julian, who has certainly admired him and crowned him with the highest praises, is not ashamed [431] to deify a swarm of idols in every form, both wood and stone, after making unholy insults against faith in God,[96] and he did not cease slaughtering oxen for them in droves,[97] in order that he might make war even against the very laws of Numa.

6.15 Furthermore, adding yet certain other insipid and nonsensical old-wives' tales, he goes on to say,

Julian

> *Zeus has clearly given these things*[98] *to the city, therefore, by divine possession and inspiration and by the* [oracles] *of the Sibyl and others who were diviners in their native language. But as to the shield that fell from the sky*[99] *and the*

[93] This seems to be an argument from silence, since Dionysius neither affirms nor denies that Numa was concerned with the construction of images when discussing his reign (see, e.g., *Ant. Rom.* 2.59, 63, 75); in his narrative of Romulus, on the other hand, Dionysius does refer to the dedication of sacred statues at Rome, as Cyril could have recognized by reading the extracts of him in Eusebius; see Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.8.2 (quoting Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 2.18). Otherwise, it seems that Cyril may be more indebted to Clement of Alexandria for his assertion here (although if so, he missed the opportunity to claim a connection with Moses, as Clement had done); see Clement, *Str.* 1.15.71.1–2, quoted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.6.3–4.

[94] In fact, Dionysius argued against the claim that Numa was a Pythagorean philosopher based on the fact that Pythagoras lived well after Numa; see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 2.59. But cf. Clement, *Str.* 1.15.71.1 (quoted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.6.3).

[95] See Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 2.75. Augustine also mentioned the goddess Faith and the temples dedicated to her at *C. D.* 4.20.

[96] Cyril perhaps has in mind *c. Gal.* fr. 88 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.39).

[97] Cf. Ammianus 22.12.6 on Julian as a butcher. Cyril here comments on an aspect of Julian's biography, something he rarely does in *c. Iul.*

[98] It is not entirely certain what Julian meant by "these things" here, although, if this quotation was taken from material in close proximity to the preceding fragment in the original text of *c. Gal.*, then it would refer to the religious laws established under Numa; see fr. 42.11–12 Mas. (= *Jul.* 6.14.15–16). On the other hand, the Sibyl is usually not connected with Numa (but rather first with Tarquinius Superbus, the last king, who purchased Sibylline oracles following a series of awkward encounters with an unknown woman; see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 4.62).

[99] For the story, which is placed under the reign of Numa, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 2.71.

head that appeared on the crest of the hill, which, I suppose, is also where the seat of Zeus the Great[100] *has received its name,*[101] *shall we count these among his primary or secondary gifts? And yet, O ill-fated people, although the heaven-sent shield is still preserved among us, which either Zeus the Great or father Ares sent – giving us a pledge, not in word but in deed, that he will shield our city in perpetuity – do you, while failing to worship and reverence*
[432] *it, instead worship the wood of the cross,*[102] *tracing images of it on your forehead,*[103] *and inscribing it on the front of your houses? Wouldn't anyone rightly hate the more intelligent among you or pity the more stupid who in following you have come to such a point of ruin that they have given up the eternal gods and changed sides to that corpse of the Jews?*[104]

Cyril

Now then, I would not at all deny that he was "possessed"[105] by a wicked spirit that fights against God, when he supposed that this was the state of things and opened his big mouth, uncontrolled and profane, against our Savior's preeminence and glory. For "no one says Jesus is accursed," "except by Beelzebul," as the all-wise Paul says.[106] But, when he further says that "*the heaven-sent shield*" and, yes, the helmet, too, or rather the "*head*," were found – I know not how – it is only natural, I think, that he should incur laughter, since this is adolescent prating and prattling,[107] nothing more.
[433] Nevertheless, we don't pay too much attention to such things.

6.16 Since he calls "*wretched*" those who are mindful of the honorable cross and take care to ensure they must always draw its sign on their houses and foreheads, we shall easily show that he is emitting from his

[100] This seems to be an abbreviated reference to the Capitoline Jupiter's title: Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

[101] For the story, which is placed under the reign of Tarquinius Superbus and explains the naming of the Capitoline Hill (*caput* being Latin for "head"), see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 4.59–61. The "seat of Zeus the Great" would be a reference to the building of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline by Tarquinius.

[102] This may be a reference to the relic of the true cross; see Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 4.10; 10.19; 13.4. For analysis of the story of its discovery during the reign of Constantine, see Drijvers 1992.

[103] Julian also refers to Christians making the sign of the cross on their foreheads at *Ep*. 79 (p.86.15–17 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 19 [pp.52–53 Wright]); cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 4.14; 12.8; 13.36.

[104] *c. Gal.* fr. 43 Mas.; Wright 1923, 370–73. Celsus similarly claimed that Christians worship a corpse at Origen, *Cels*. 7.36; 7.68.

[105] Cyril plays off of Julian's use of "possession" in the first line of the preceding fragment.

[106] In fact, for polemical impact Cyril has artfully stitched together a verse from 1 Cor 12:3 ("no one speaking in the Spirit of God says Jesus is accursed") and a verse from Matt 12:24 (the Pharisees were saying, "This man does not cast out daemons, except by Beelzebul the ruler of daemons").

[107] Gk.: τερθρεία … καὶ μειρακιώδη τερετίσματα. Elsewhere, Cyril applies the latter term to women's talk; see *c. Iul.* 3.20.10 (where we have given "chirruping"); 6.32.5.

fallacious reasoning words that reek of an extreme stupidity. For, to begin with, although he who is the Savior and Lord of the universe could lay claim to being seen "in the form" and in equality with the Father in every way whatsoever and could pride himself[108] in the seats of divinity, "he did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave."[109] And then he even "endured the cross, despising its shame,"[110] in order that he might nullify the power of corruption. One person died and was raised for the sake of all, in order that he might snatch the human race from the nooses of death;[111] in order that he might destroy the tyranny of the sin which prevailed over us; in order that he might tame the law that ran wild in the limbs of the flesh[112] and might render us spiritual worshippers,[113] and, by putting to death "the mind of the flesh" in us,[114] might render those who believe in him to be sons of God[115] and might sanctify them through his Spirit;[116] and finally in order that he might frighten from their greedy grasping after everyone both Satan, that sinful beast who is the source of evil, and also the wicked [434]
powers under him, those powers that, indeed, are named "*ethnarchs and city-guarding*" gods by the one who revels in slandering us.[117] The wood that procures our salvation brings us back to the remembrance of all these things, and in addition it makes us understand that, as Paul says, "One died for the sake of all, in order that those who live would live no longer for themselves, but for the one who died and rose for them."[118] It is clear to everyone that living for God, namely, conducting ourselves in a reverent and holy manner, renders those who have chosen to do this thrice-blessed. As for ourselves, therefore, as I said, we take the wood of the honorable cross as a reminder[119] of every good thing and every virtue.

6.17 But since he doesn't suppose this practice to be free from slander and blame, he ought once more to explain himself. For I shall put the question: "If you want, after hanging[120] panels on the walls of our rooms,

[108] Gk.: ἐναβρύνεσθαι; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.45.45. [109] Phil 2:6–7. [110] Heb 12:2.
[111] For the phrase, see *c. Iul.* 6.13.19. [112] i.e., the law of sin; see Rom 7:23. [113] Cf. John 4:23.
[114] Cf. Col 3:5; Rom 8:6.
[115] This paraphrases John 1:12 ("he gave them power to become children of God, to those who believe in his name").
[116] Cf. 1 Cor 6:11; 2 Thess 2:13; 1 Pet 1:2.
[117] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 26.3; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12; 4.40.4; 4.46.7–8). [118] 2 Cor 5:15.
[119] In this, the wood of the cross seems to mirror the tree in Eden, which was to serve as a remembrance of the divine legislator; see *c. Iul.* 3.15–17.
[120] Although "hanging" (ἐπαρτήσαντες) lacks any manuscript witness (having only been suggested in 1638 in Aubert's appendix), the two alternatives given in the manuscripts (ἐπικροτήσαντες and ἐπικρατήσαντες) inadequately fit the syntax and sense of this sentence. We have thus followed the GCS edition in adopting Aubert's suggested emendation.

let's call a painter of expert hand and then let's say to him: 'O painter, our aim is to support boys in their physical prime learning how lack of restraint contributes to their ruin and our purpose is to persuade the women at the hearth that disorderliness is not without consequence for them. But verbal instruction from their usual teachers is probably insufficient to get them to choose to live rightly and blamelessly. A painting should also be set up in their view as comrade in arms alongside the words of those in charge of them. Surely, therefore, we should have Zeus the highest of the gods painted on the panels before anything else, and
[435] settled beside him, if you'd like, should also be his boy from Phrygia, I mean Ganymede, his venerable and noteworthy plaything and the proof of his uncontrolled licentiousness.[121] Alcmene, too, should be painted, with whom he spent nine nights in his insatiability for even the most shameful deeds. Semele, likewise, should be present and the great crowd of women [who had been consorts of Zeus]. Poseidon, too, should be seen beside him, with the women standing at his side whom he corrupted in unholy manner, Amymone, Alope, Hippothoe, and the others. Yes indeed, and the Lydian boy should be painted with him, I mean Pelops. Smiling Aphrodite should be prominent on the panels consorting with her many lovers. That sweet-smelling tree, O painter, nearly eluded me, I mean Daphne, and the stories babbled about her. Paint for me Apollo being overcome by a child virtuous in her dignified conduct.[122] And let the young girl escape, despising defilement; but nonetheless, have Phoebus pursue, even if he cannot catch his beloved; let him be crowned with her branches lest his crime be forgotten.' So do you want us then, noble sir, to neglect the wood that reminds us of every virtue and, pushing it aside, to present these images of yours to the boys and women instead? No doubt the gods and goddesses in their lewd
[436] behavior and indeed also the corruptions of boys and women would be conducive to the benefit of viewers? Isn't this now, in fact, a cause for laughter and a clear proof of the ultimate madness?"

6.18 But he says we came to complete "*ruin*," first because we departed from "*the eternal gods*" and then because we chose instead "*that corpse of the Jews.*"[123] If so, then how, tell me, can you say that those who are generated and have been brought into existence in time are "*eternal*"? For

[121] This and nearly all the other mythological exempla mentioned in this passage could have been drawn from Clement, *Prot.* 2.32–33.

[122] For the well-known story of Daphne's resistance to Apollo's attempted rape, see Parthenius of Nicaea, *Erot.* 15; Ovid, *Met.* 1.473–552.

[123] See *c. Gal.* fr. 43 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.15.17–19).

didn't your own Plato say that the more visible and intelligible gods have been crafted?[124] How, therefore, can something be "*eternal*" when it has been brought into generation and set in motion in time, and also is susceptible to corruption in accordance with its inherent natural principles, if it is really true that everything generated would invariably and without exception also be subject to an inevitable process of corruption?

Now when he mentions a "*corpse*," he is referring to Christ and this is not surprising: for he has gone astray and fails to see the venerable mystery of the incarnation, since otherwise he would not have referred to the one who "tasted death"[125] in the flesh for the purpose of destroying death as a "*corpse.*" For how could he who gave new life to many others succumb to corruption? In fact, it was part of his plan to allow the flesh that had become his through deliberate appropriation to encounter death,[126] and yet he came back to life and has trampled upon corruption, in order that in him first the ability to overcome death and corruption might become accessible for human nature and easily traversed. For this reason he has been named "the firstborn from the dead"[127] and "the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep,"[128] since, as the divine Paul says, "Just as all die in Adam, so also in Christ all will be made alive."[129] [437]

6.19 But Julian's mind has reached such a point of ignorance and extreme sickness that he prides himself even in those very matters where he could expect to face the most serious accusations. "*For*," he says, "*I refrain from mentioning the mysteries of the Mother of the Gods* < … > *and I am seeking to emulate Marius*."[130] That's good! Because aren't these mysteries the plaything of Dardanus? For he himself was the founder of the madness of the Corybantes, the clandestine initiations in the caves of Ida, and licentious mysteries.[131] And yet aren't things that are full of

[124] Gk.: δεδημιουργῆσθαι, literally, "made by a craftsman," referring to the Demiurge of Plato's *Timaeus*; see e.g., *Ti.* 41a7, with Julian's discussion at *c. Gal.* fr. 10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.43.9–28).

[125] Heb 2:9.

[126] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς ὁμιλῆσαι θανάτῳ τὴν γενομένην αὐτοῦ σάρκα κατ' οἰκείωσιν οἰκονομικήν.

[127] Col 1:18.

[128] 1 Cor 15:20. *c. Iul.* 6.18.10–20 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 860.

[129] 1 Cor 15:22.

[130] *c. Gal.* fr. 44 Mas.; Wright 1923, 372–73. Julian, in fact, composed an entire oration titled *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods* (*ad deor. matr.*). Moreover, Ammianus reported that, as he traveled from Constantinople to Antioch in 362, Julian made a detour to visit Pessinus, where the cult of the Mother of the Gods, or Cybele, had originated (22.9.5). In 204 BC, during the Second Punic War, the goddess's sacred stone was taken from Pessinus to Rome, and the importance of the cult in Rome is probably the reason Julian mentions it here in the context of tales of Rome's storied past. The event is also mentioned in passing in Augustine, *C. D.* 3.12; 10.16.

[131] Cf. Diodorus Siculus 5.49.2, where Dardanus is paired with Cybele (the Mother of the Gods) and Corybas as transmitters of the mysteries to Asia.

obsolete and unholy narratives always and inevitably harmful to those who hear them?

Moreover, he himself counts it a divine blessing that Marius was given to the Romans, a man who ruled for a time but then became most superstitious and cruel, and indeed even descended to such a savage state of
[438] mind that he slaughtered upon the altars of daemons his charming and sweet little girl, whom he cherished and held dearest of all. For he knew for sure that this was the way, yes this was the way the good gods wanted to be honored and that they were delighted at their own servants adopting a mindset that went beyond every evil so that they considered nothing better than for the parents themselves to become murderers of their own dearest children![132]

If, therefore, he praises Marius and holds him in admiration, he should accuse those who do not want to do the same things as him. He should persuade the worshippers of the "*ethnarch and city-guarding [gods]*" to desire the generation of children, not so that their children might call them papa[133] at home and their family extend to their children's children, but so that, with their children's blood, they might enchant those gods who are so very civilized, since these are presumably the most special of sacrifices for them! And even if someone is a murderer of his own children he should be free from indictment. But since anyone, I think, would quite rightly say that such a man was untamed, wild-tempered, and more cruel than the wild beasts themselves, and since indeed also the universal law of nature itself indicts him for having arrived at the most cruel and unholy idea of all, why does Julian admire him and why does he say that he was the most special of the gifts given by the gods when, if anyone were to choose to "*emulate him*," that person would be unholy and hated by all humanity? Tell me, is this the gift of the gods? Or would it perhaps actually be right to affirm what he had said? For this gift of friendship[134] is a good fit for [the gods], and they freely grant to their own [worshippers] the things that they have also decided to honor.

[132] The Roman general Marius (157–86 BC) was also discussed in Augustine, *C. D.* 2.22–23, who criticized his ruthlessness but did not mention the incident Cyril describes above, though it was mentioned at Clement, *Prot.* 3.42.7 (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.16.12). On human sacrifice, including children, see also *c. Iul.* 4.18–20.

[133] Gk.: παππάζοιεν, a rare Homeric word.

[134] Gk.: ξένιον. Cyril's comments imply that Julian designated Marius a "gift" of the gods (for Julian's precise use of the phrase "gift of the gods" later, see *c. Gal.* fr. 55.18 Mas. = *c. Iul.* 7.16.32–33 with note), though the language here is redolent of Cyril's own descriptions elsewhere of Christ (and the benefits of Christ's incarnation) as a "gift" and "gift of friendship" (or "guest-gift," ξένιον) of God (see, e.g., *Agg.* 2:9 [2.268.1 Pusey]; *Dial. Trin.* 3.502.32, 42; *Ador.* 11 [PG 68.761a]; *Glaph. Gen. 2; Gen. 3; Ex. 1* [PG 69.105c; 116a; 409a]; *Is.* 55:12 [PG 70.1233d; 1236b]; cf.

6.20 And at any rate, not only does he say Marius was given by the gods but that, in addition to this, the modes of false-divination were invented by them too. He writes as follows: [439]

Julian

The spirit that comes to humans from the gods occurs rarely and only among a few, and no one easily or always has a share of it. Surely it is for this reason that the spirit among the Hebrews has failed and is, of course, no longer preserved among the Egyptians. And even the native oracles seem <to have become silent,>[135] *yielding to the cycles of time; indeed, our humane master and father Zeus, considering that we shouldn't be altogether deprived of fellowship with the gods, has granted us inspection [of divinatory signs] through the sacred arts, by which we shall have help sufficient for our needs.*[136]

Cyril

So, by "*spirit from the gods*" he here means the spirit of the false-diviners, since it was their habit to feign being inspired[137] and to appear to have been possessed by a mantic spirit so that their deception would be readily accepted. There were a great many of them and the method of their sorcery was varied. For there were bird-watchers and fire-diviners, and barley-diviners as well; besides them, there were liver-inspectors and those who busied themselves[138] with the puffs of smoke leaping into the air from sacrifices; there were also necromancers, belly-mythers,[139] and

Is. 45:8 [PG 70.960a], where the dignity of humanity's being made in God's image is deemed to be "a gift of friendship and gift" of God's artistry). Alternatively, "gift of friendship" can refer to a person's sacrifice offered to God (see, e.g., *Mal.* 1:8 [2.560.8 Pusey]; *Ador.* 16 [PG 68.1056b]) or to the collective of the church as a votive or "gift of friendship" (see *Is.* 60:20–21 [PG 70.1448a]) or to a Christological oration composed by Cyril for the emperor (*De recta fide* 4 [ACO 1.1.1, p.44.16]). More to the point, humans offered in sacrifice by the Taurians are named a "gift of friendship" to the gods (see *c. Iul.* 4.19.11). The present passage indicates that the gods/daemons enjoy human sacrifice, as do their worshippers, so they have gifted a person to humans who will make them such sacrifices.

135 We follow the GCS in adopting Neumann's supplement here, which receives support from the fact that Cyril uses this term when quoting this phrase below at *c. Iul.* 6.20.25–26.

136 *c. Gal.* fr. 45 Mas.; Wright 1923, 372–73.

137 Gk.: τὸ ἐνθουσιᾶν.

138 Gk.: πολυπραγμονοῦντες; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

139 We have opted for a very literal translation of the Greek (ἐγγαστρίμυθοι) in order to draw out the ambiguity behind this form of divination, which is literally rendered as "[divinatory] speech in the stomach/womb" and more loosely as "ventriloquism." The term was used to refer to the "witch of Endor" (1 Kgdms [1 Sam] 28:7–9), who became the subject of reflection among many early Christian thinkers and preachers; see Greer and Mitchell 2007.

[440] augurs.[140] So then, he says the diabolical spirit in them has left. And I certainly applaud his words, but he has ignored the reason the falsehood has stopped working, and the fact that, to use his own words, "*the native oracles*" have "*become silent*." For, when Christ shone on the world, all the tyranny of daemons was shaken,[141] and like some stage full of child's play,[142] the deception has been completely destroyed, and the entirely profane and sinful daemons have become "possessed"[143] by the gates of Hades, although they had formerly wandered the whole earth.

6.21 Nevertheless, Julian ought to explain the following for us: in what way "*have the native oracles become silent*," in his view, "*yielding to the cycles of time*"?[144] And furthermore, if he who was attempting to indicate future events to people long ago actually was well and truly a god, why does he succumb to the times, no doubt with the knowledge in him being diminished to a smaller amount than before? If so, how can Julian say they are "*eternal*"[145] when they are subject to time and all but experience growing old, so as to differ but little from our own condition? Accordingly, he says, since "*the oracles*" have "*become silent*" and the Pythian, now senile, has no doubt lost his wits and no longer knows his habitual modes of deceptive falsehoods, Zeus "*has granted us inspection [of divinatory signs]* and assistance *through the sacred arts*."[146] What are you doing, noble sir? Are you saying that the accursed forms of false-divination and no doubt of sorcery, too, are venerable and "*sacred arts*" and that the knowledge of how to perform them confers benefit to those on earth? Are you saying that these things "*have been given*" to humanity to assist them and that this gift has come to them as if it were a most advantageous assistance
[441] "*from Zeus*"? Quite right, dear sir; for it was necessary, yes necessary, that your "*father*" and emperor make use of such shameful munificence in

[140] These three forms of divination are grouped together (though in a different order and with somewhat different wording) at Deut 18:11.

[141] For a similar claim, see Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.4.5 (with discussion at Johnson 2006a, 175–78); cf. also, e.g., Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.17.4; *D.e.* 4.10.13; 4.12.7, 9; 6.20.11–12.

[142] Interestingly, Cyril has diverged from his earlier use of "plaything/play" (ἄθυρμα) as a sexual innuendo (a "boytoy"; see the description of Ganymede at *c. Iul.* 6.17.13–14: τὸ ἐκ Φρυγίας αὐτῷ μειράκιον, τὸν Γανυμήδη λέγω, τὸ σεμνὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀξιάκουστον ἄθυρμα) to the more innocent "child's play" here. Elsewhere, Cyril seems to have recognized the rhetorical effect of describing idolatry or daemonic work as "boys' playthings/play" in comparison to the power of Christ; see *c. Iul.* 10.38.10; *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.445a); *Zach.* 13:2 (2.501.10 Pusey). For similar phrasing (but in a different context), see Clement, *Prot.* 2.17.2 (ἀπατήσαντες παιδαριώδεσιν ἀθύρμασιν οὗτοι δὴ οἱ Τιτᾶνες), quoted by Eusebius at *P.e.* 2.3.23.

[143] Gk.: κάτοχοι; Cyril seems to be punning on the word for "possession" (κατοχή), which he had used just previously, at *c. Iul.* 6.20.17, as well as alluding to *c. Gal.* fr. 43 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.15.4).

[144] *c. Gal.* fr. 45.6–8 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.20.9–10).

[145] *c. Gal.* fr. 43.15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.15.18).

[146] *c. Gal.* fr. 45.10–11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.20.12–13).

order that he might clearly be seen granting things that are inconsistent with the established laws and might make those who are practiced in them, or arguably even those who have merely been privy to others doing them, liable to the worst forms of punishment.[147]

6.22 Furthermore, whereas Julian says that the prophetic "*spirit*" "*among the Hebrews*" themselves has also failed, we say that Christ has become "the fulfillment of the Law"[148] and prophets. For they have all heralded in advance the mystery of Christ, those ones who have at various times become holy and received knowledge of the future, since God implanted it in them through the Holy Spirit. But when he himself came into our midst and became manifest to those on earth, the grace of ancient prophecy went quiet, though even now God makes future events reverberate within the saints as he pleases and he abides in holy souls. Accordingly, he should not say that the Spirit has failed, but rather that our affairs were transformed into a newness of grace.[149]

Acting as though his argument had won approval for its previous claims, he also adds something else and says, [442]

Julian

I had nearly forgotten the greatest of Helios' and Zeus's gifts. But with good reason I have saved it until the end. For it is not peculiar only to us [Romans], but is, I think, held in common with our kinsmen the Greeks.[150] *<Indeed>, Zeus gave birth to Asclepius from himself in the intelligible realm and revealed him to the earth through the life of nurturing Helios.*[151] *Having advanced*[152] *to earth from the sky, Asclepius at first appeared at Epidaurus singularly*[153] *in the*

147 In fact, Julian's followers were targeted by subsequent emperors for their divinatory consultations and other forms of magic; see Lenski 2002, 218–34. For a general survey of laws against divination, see Trombley 2001, 1: 59–72.

148 Rom 10:4; Cyril here seems to pun on the double meaning of τέλος (rather than being an "end" of the prophetic Spirit, Christ was the "fulfillment" of the Law). Furthermore, he almost always adds "and the prophets" to his quotation of this verse, which is a favorite of his. Cf. Zaganas 2019, 244–46.

149 Cf. Rom 6:4.

150 Julian here and elsewhere expresses the longstanding assumption that the Romans could trace their lineage to Greek migrants who traveled to Italy; see Johnson 2012a, 450.

151 On the generation of Asclepius from Helios, see also Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 22.144b; 39.153b. In the latter passage Julian refers to him as "Savior of the universe" (τὸν σωτῆρα τῶν ὅλων), echoing a title commonly used by Christians for Jesus; for Julian's parallelism of Asclepius and Christ (to the detriment of the latter's standing), see Bouffartigue 1992, 649; Greenwood 2021, 84. Celsus had similarly mentioned Asclepius in his critique of Christianity (see Origen, *Cels.* 3.3; 3.22).

152 Literally, "having made a procession (πρόοδον)." Julian is adopting the Neoplatonic notion of "procession" of lower ontological levels of existence from higher ones; see Plotinus 4.8.6.5; 5.2.1.27; 5.5.3.9; 6.3.22.47.

form of a human,[154] *but multiplying himself from there in stages,*[155] *he stretched out his saving right hand over all the earth.*[156] *He went to Pergamon, to Ionia, and afterwards to Tarentum. Later he went to Rome.*[157] *He departed to Cos and from there to Aegae. Accordingly, he is everywhere on land and sea. He does not visit us individually, and yet he restores souls that have a discordant disposition and bodies that are sick.*[158]

Cyril

6.23 So then, he gives himself airs when he says that Asclepius was born of Zeus "*in the intelligible realm*" and yet appeared "*in the form of a*
[443] *human*." For surely the story told by everyone would have it that he was born from Coronis and Apollo, when she committed adultery in all likelihood with one of the priests in the temple of Apollo.[159] But this man, on the other hand, since he is always a liar, is both thinking about and relating a tall and solemn tale about him, even though a great many things inconsistent with this have been written about him by the elite ranks of Greeks. For, indeed, Apis[160] the Egyptian is said to have been one of the better-known temple-dwellers there and to have accumulated the knowledge of so-called natural philosophy. And they say that he was first to pursue expertise in medicine and was better at making discoveries [in that field] than those who came before him, and moreover that he passed it on to Asclepius who, when he became good at the art, was no longer content to loiter among the Egyptian cities but, being a lover of money and extraordinarily weak when it came to shameful profit, wandered about in every land, so to speak, collecting donations from many people and putting his practice up for sale to those who were suffering. And

[153] Gk.: ἐνοειδῶς; cf. Plotinus 6.9.5.24–29.

[154] This phrase (ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ) would appear to be a clear allusion to Phil 2:7 (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος); see Greenwood 2021, 85. Cf. Celsus' comments on what it would mean for a god to visit humanity, a notion that he rejects, at Origen, *Cels.* 4.14; 5.2.

[155] Gk.: περιόδοις, literally, "circuits." Julian could be intentionally using Neoplatonic language of the descent of the soul through the spheres. Cf. Plotinus 6.4.16.

[156] All of the fragment up till this point will be quoted again at *c. Iul.* 8.50.10–18.

[157] Asclepius' journey from Epidaurus to Rome was also mentioned in Augustine, *C. D.* 3.12.

[158] *c. Gal.* fr. 46 Mas.; Wright 1923, 374–75. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 57 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.24.4–19), where Julian refers to Asclepius' prescription of remedies to Julian (apparently personally, although in light of the present fragment, Julian seems to believe that a personal visitation of the god did not restrict him from simultaneously being everywhere).

[159] Cyril will revisit the topic of cultic sex in *c. Iul.* 7.37.

[160] Cf. Clement, *Str.* 1.16.75.2 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 10.6.1), where Apis is mentioned as a doctor before Asclepius, but no personal connection is noted; it is unlikely that Cyril is drawing on these apologetic predecessors here.

being exalted by his art and having high and mighty thoughts because of it, he both began to name himself a god and to fantasize absurdly that he was capable of resurrecting certain persons from the dead.[161] When he came to the people of Epidaurus and snatched[162] an impressive reputation among them of even being some god, he was struck by lightning as God sent a punishment that was most appropriate to him and proved by his suffering that he was nothing at all except earth and ash.[163]

Would it not be worthwhile to see what sort of things the lyric poet Pindar says about him?

> Gold shining in his hands influenced that man with his headstrong heart. [444]
> […][164]
> With his hands, the son of Cronus, hurling [his lightning] through the chests of both [Asclepius and the man he raised], swiftly destroyed them,
> and the fiery thunderbolt brought doom upon them.[165]

Moreover, Euripides the tragic poet maintains that Apollo said,

> For Zeus is to blame, having killed my son Asclepius by hurling fire into his chest.[166]

6.24 Then why did God completely burn up with fire the greatest and most special "*of Zeus's and Helios' gifts*,"[167] to use Julian's words, despite the fact that he weighs human affairs in the balance with a just verdict and knows how to distribute either rewards, perchance, or penalties according to due proportion and what is fitting to each person's character?

[161] On the topic of human inventors and cultural benefactors receiving divine honors, cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.2.53–61 (= Diodorus on Euhemerus); 2.5.5; 7.2.2. For broader context, see Thraede 1962, 1966.

[162] It seems that Cyril, picking up on Julian's allusions to Phil 2 (to the detriment of Christ's representation), is here adding his own (to the detriment of Asclepius' representation): whereas Asclepius here "snatched a considerable reputation of even being some god" (δόξαν ἁρπάσας οὐκ ἀγεννῆ … τοῦ καὶ θεὸς εἶναί τις), Christ "who was in his form God, did not consider equality with God a thing to be snatched" (ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ; Phil 2:6).

[163] Cyril will again mention Asclepius' manner of death at *c. Iul.* 7.26.9–11; 8.50.22–25. It had previously been highlighted by Origen at *Cels.* 3.22. Note that Cyril's comments above imply that he accepts the legend of his execution but maintains that the one true God was responsible for it, rather than Zeus.

[164] A line of Pindar's ode is missing: "to bring back from death a man who had already been caught [by it]."

[165] Pindar, *P.* 3.55, 57–58; cited (with variants) also by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 29.2; Clement, *Prot.* 2.30.1; Eusebius, *P.e.* 3.13.19.

[166] Euripides, *Alc.* 3–4; cited also by Clement, *Prot.* 2.30.2.

[167] *c. Gal.* fr. 46.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.22.15), but with the order of names switched.

"Nevertheless," Julian says, "the medical art benefited our life." Is it, then, for this reason right to proclaim that those who become good at it are gods? Yet one might observe that there are also other fields of knowledge and arts involving manual labor that are not pointless inventions, but rather supremely beneficial to those in this life. Shall we then crown with the honor of divinity those who were first to practice them or those who have obtained a more illustrious reputation than others in each
[445] domain?[168] If, therefore, the son of Coronis accomplished something appropriate for a god, if he sent light into the blind when their eyes had worn out, if he commanded the dead to return to life, if he told those maimed in their legs to return home rejoicing after making them sound in their joints, then he deserves to be enriched with due admiration from us as well. But if, on the contrary, he became famous for some sick people [who got better], he ought to be praised for best pursuing medical expertise, but yet not dishonor the saying "Know thyself."[169]

6.25 Hence,[170] this most excellent man has deified a doctor who is a lover of wealth and a braggart, and indeed, raising his arrogant eyebrow because of him, he again says the following:

Julian

But what sort of thing like this can the Hebrews boast that God has given them, those for whom you are persuaded to desert us?[171] *At least if you were adhering to their discourses, you would not have fared so completely wretchedly, and, though worse off than before when you were together with us, nevertheless you would have suffered in a bearable and tolerable manner. For you would at least be worshipping one god in place of many, instead of a human being, or rather many wretched humans. And while in other areas you would be worse by living under a harsh and rough law containing much savagery*
[446] *and barbarity instead of our noble and humane ones, nonetheless in the performance of sacred rites you would be more holy and pure.*[172] *But now it has*

168 See Thraede 1962.

169 For an earlier reference to the famous inscription at Delphi, see *c. Iul.* 3.50.18 with note. Here Cyril intends it to mean that Asclepius (and Julian) should recognize the created status of all but God, rather than falsely applying the divine title to themselves.

170 Hammerstaedt 1996, 91–95 argued that *c. Iul.* 6.25–29 has been adapted from Theodoret's *Affect.*; but see Kinzig, GCS 20, CLIX n. 553 for continued uncertainty on the relationship of these two texts.

171 For the theme of Christian "desertion" from the Greeks (first raised in *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.9.1–14]), see our Introduction; it will be picked up again below at *c. Gal.* fr. 49 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.37.5).

172 For Julian's view of Jewish sacrificial rites, see *c. Gal.* frs. 69; 70; 71; 72; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.13; 9.14; 9.21; 9.22; 10.22; 10.26; 10.31; 10.34; 10.37; 10.39).

turned out that you have sucked the worst blood from them like leeches and neglected that which is purer.[173]

Cyril

6.26 Now the gifts that were given to the Hebrews were many and precious, the very sort one would admire and show to have most justly come from God who has authority over the universe, and not at all like what those who have wandered from the truth boast of having personally received from "*Helios and Zeus*."[174] For it was inevitable, yes inevitable, that those whom they call "*city-guarding and ethnarch gods*"[175] or rather daemons would give gifts befitting their own abominations,[176] while, on the contrary, the one who is the sovereign ruler of the universe, truly being God by nature, would appoint those who reverence his sovereignty and are like loyal shield-bearers to be menders of souls and bodies for the inhabitants of the earth: Elijah, that man who was a Tishbite; Elisha; the others who were allotted a most illustrious reputation at that time for their virtues; those who lived at the time of Christ, I mean Peter, John, and the others, whose mere shadows were sufficient for the removal of what was detrimental to the sick; the eminent Paul; as well as those who came after him. I shall refrain from mentioning them individually, but anyone who wants to can even to this day see venerable and holy men censuring wicked daemons in the power of Christ through the Holy Spirit, and using the power of prayer to crush the beings whom those people believe to be gods and saviors, maiming them with a touch of their hand and indeed also managing to free those held down by diverse infirmities. [447]

6.27 But since he won't let go of those who have despised falsehood and who all but shouted down the Greeks' deception, those who have wisely chosen the truth instead and have recognized the one who is both God by nature and Craftsman of the universe, and since he says, "You were deceived when you *adhered to the discourses* of the Christians and you *do not worship one* God but rather *a human being* and *many* other

[173] *c. Gal.* fr. 47 Mas.; Wright 1923, 374–77. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9.10–14), where Julian said Christians have drawn "defects" from the Greeks and Hebrews, as well as *c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.28) where he expands on this topic.

[174] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 46.3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.22.15).

[175] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 26.3; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12; 4.40.4; 4.46.7–8).

[176] While Cyril frequently designates the activity and worship of daemons as an abomination (βδελυρία), here it may carry the additional function of serving as a pun on Julian's comparison of Christians with leeches (βδέλλαι) above.

wretched ones, and you were yoked to *a harsh law*, both *savage and barbaric*,"[177] I suppose it necessary also to confront this attack with cogent counterarguments. Now when he says "*a human being*" he is referring to Christ, and by "*many wretched ones*" he means the holy martyrs, who he says are also under "*a harsh law*," because our Lord Jesus Christ declared: "Have no fear of those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; fear rather the one who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna."[178]

Our response, Your Excellency, would be as follows: We have not deified a human being, as you have supposed, nor do we think it right to worship one who is not God by nature. Rather, we say that the Word himself who has shone forth from God the Father, the one through whom all things were brought into existence, having decided to preserve
[448] the human race, became flesh and was incarnate and he came forth as a human being from the holy virgin.[179] Since, after all, his divine and ineffable glory is both unapproachable and in no way bearable, and even more is entirely beyond the reach of our sight, he became incarnate in order that by living with those on earth for a certain definite period of time in an accommodating manner[180] like one of us, insofar as he was manifest as a human being, he might persuade us to know who is by nature the sole God of the universe, and, in order that, by rendering us experts in every virtue, he might join us to himself through sanctification, destroying every rule, authority and wicked power, and releasing us from the falsely named gods. So then, it is not a matter of worshipping a human being[181] as you suppose and say and deem it right to think. How could it be? Recognizing that the Word of God was manifest as a human being, we approach him as God insofar as he is God as well and has shone forth from God the Father, remaining unchanged and unalterable, as the mystery about him was declared in advance by the all-wise Moses with subtlety and precision, while the holy prophets also made a prediction that agreed with Moses' words.

6.28 With respect to the holy martyrs, however, we do not say that they are gods nor are we accustomed to worship them.[182] On the contrary, we crown them with highest honors for being genuine athletes for the truth and safeguarding the authenticity of their faith to such a degree that they disregarded even life[183] itself and, bidding farewell to

[177] See *c. Gal.* fr. 47 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.25). [178] Matt 10:28.
[179] *c. Iul.* 6.27.16–20 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 862.
[180] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς. [181] Gk.: ἀνθρωπολατρία.
[182] Augustine makes the same distinction at *C. D.* 8.27. [183] Gk.: ψυχῆς.

fears of death, they not only prevailed over all danger but also erected [449]
their own achievements like images, as it were, of such admirable bravery for the benefit of human life.[184] Therefore, it was not unreasonable, but doubtless even necessary, that those who boasted of such illustrious accomplishments be crowned with undying honors. And we shall find that doing so was likewise irreproachable among the ancient Greeks themselves. For it was customary for the Athenians, when they were assembled at the very tombs, to crown with yearly encomia those who "at Marathon were foremost in daring"[185] in defense of all Greece and those who later fought nobly against the army of Xerxes, since they endured a glorious death.[186] If so, then why can't this most excellent man let the obligation of honoring the saints go free of critical scrutiny?

And yet, even Plato himself says about those who have chosen to live in the best way and have died not ignobly:

> Certainly for the rest of the time, we shall serve them on the understanding that they have died and become daemons and we shall worship at their graves. And certainly, we shall practice these same customs whenever anyone of those who have been judged distinctively good in life should die in old age or in some other way.[187]

So says your Plato, Your Excellency. But, as I said, we ourselves do not claim that the holy martyrs became gods but are accustomed to treat them with all respect and we honor their graves, establishing an unfading memo- [450]
rial for them as a kind of prize and recompense for such illustrious bravery.

6.29 Furthermore, since he groundlessly rails at those who are faithful to Christ for senselessly choosing many godless humans instead of dutifully serving one God, we shall attempt to show that he has drenched the worshippers of truth in an unholy flood of accusations that better characterize Greek ignorance. For they have sacrificed to humans, and shameful and licentious ones who are sick with every kind of reproachable conduct, at that! – like the renowned Heracles who they say was born to Alcmene and Zeus and to whom they ascribe that great and special prize

[184] Cyril will return to the issue of Christian devotion to the martyrs at *c. Iul.* 10.11–16; fr. 64a; and fr. 64b. In his other works he rarely talks about the cult of the martyrs, but it was a flashpoint in the tumultuous early years of his episcopacy, as recounted in Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 7.14. During Cyril's tense power struggle with the imperial prefect Orestes, a Nitrian monk named Ammonius threw a stone at Orestes, striking him in the head. The citizens of Alexandria seized the monk and handed him over to the prefect, who tortured him so severely he died. Cyril then placed Ammonius' body in a church, enrolled him among the martyrs with the new name Thaumasius, and delivered an encomium in his honor, just as he says here should be done for those who "are genuine athletes for the truth."

[185] Demosthenes, *De cor.* 208.4; cf. Plato, *Mx.* 240e4–5.

[186] See *c. Iul.* 10.13; frs. 64a; 64b.

[187] Plato, *R.* 5.469a8–b2; also cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.11.1; Theodoret, *Affect.* 8.46.

of deflowering fifty virgins in one night. And likewise, others have been honored by them with the glory of God: the Hermes of Thebes, the Asclepius of Memphis, and besides them the Dioscuri, and Apis and Osiris.[188] I won't even mention the licentious and profane son of Semele;[189] but I will add Cleomedes who they say was cruel, harsh, and scarcely different from a wild animal when it came to boxing, and for this very reason, as they themselves say, the Pythian praised him and exclaimed from his sacred tripods,

> Last of the heroes is Cleomedes the Astypalaean,
> whom you should honor with sacrifices as no longer mortal.[190]

Illustrious are the honors for inhumanity you bestow on athletes, O
[451] Pythian! O the gentleness of the gods! O their generosity! He who is bloodstained and bloodthirsty is registered among the gods. For this activity is sweet, yes sweet, to them. And those who lived at that time decided to name Alexander, son of Philip, a thirteenth god;[191] and indeed, Alexander himself likewise deified a certain one of his associates who procured disreputable women for him – I mean, Hephaestion – and he ordered that he be honored with an altar and sacrifices.[192] But, indeed, if one wanted to give all the details they would waste a lot of words doing so, since those who have filched the name of divinity are too many to count.

6.30 Anyone can see from the following that it was common practice for them to give the name of gods freely to any persons they wanted. For indeed Clement, having followed the holy apostles at every turn and listening to a very great amount of Greek history, says in his *Stromateis* that the Jew Josephus, who obtained a not unremarkable reputation for his education, translated the history of Senchoniathon, which had been composed in the language of the Phoenicians, into that of the Greeks.[193] Accordingly, this Senchoniathon, albeit full of Greek superstition, says,

[188] On Apis and Osiris, cf. *c. Iul.* 1.16.1–15. [189] i.e., Dionysus.

[190] Reported in Oenomaus, fr. 12 (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 5.34.2; cf. Theodoret, *Affect.* 8.26; 10.38). A slightly different form of the second line is reported in Pausanias 6.9.8; cf. Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 3.23.57.

[191] On Alexander's inclusion as a thirteenth among the twelve Olympians, see Aelian, *VH* 5.12; Clement, *Prot.* 10.96.4; John Chrysostom, *Hom. in II Cor.* 26.4 (PG 61.580d); with Fredericksmeyer 1979, especially 59–60.

[192] See Diodorus Siculus 17.115.6.

[193] In fact, Clement nowhere cites Senchoniathon (in other sources spelled Sanchouniathon) in any of his extant works and mentions Josephus only at *Str.* 1.21.147.2. Cyril has no doubt obscured his source, namely Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.9.29 (with several alterations; cf. Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.44–46; 3.25), possibly intentionally; see Johnson 2019.

> For, the most ancient of the Greeks,[194] but particularly the Phoenicians and Egyptians, from whom the rest of humanity borrowed [their traditions], used to believe that those who discovered things essential for sustaining life or who benefited the nations in some way were the greatest gods. Considering such persons to be benefactors responsible for many good things, they used to worship them as gods and, constructing temples [452]
> that were established as necessary, they used to consecrate pillars and staffs in their name and, showing them great reverence, the Phoenicians used to assign the greatest festivals to them. And, in particular, they naturalistically assigned the names of their own kings as well to the elements of the cosmos and to some of those they believed to be gods. They used to recognize as gods only the sun, moon, the planets, the elements, and whatever was related to these, and they recognized some to be mortal and others immortal.[195]

And so, it is hardly us, but rather the Greeks who would be unmasked as those who worship human beings[196] and uncritically attach the glory of God to whomever they might wish throughout time.

6.31 The wise Julian adds to this certain other points, constantly denouncing the Christians' worship. He writes as follows:

Julian

> *For, if he*[197] *has mentioned ritual purity, you do not know it; instead, you emulate their*[198] *rage and bitterness by overturning temples and altars and you have slaughtered not only those of us who abide by the ways of our fathers*[199] *but also those sectarians who have gone astray just as much as you but do not* [453]
> *mourn over the corpse in the same manner as yourselves.*[200] *Nevertheless, these*

[194] Eusebius' text reads βαρβάρων ("barbarians") in place of Cyril's Ἑλλήνων ("Greeks").
[195] Cyril has taken this passage from Eusebius, *P.e.* 1.9.29 (= Philo Byblius FGrHist 790 F 1).
[196] Gk.: ἀνθρωπολάτραι.
[197] It seems that Moses (or the Mosaic writings) is the implied subject of this line.
[198] It seems that the pronoun here refers to the Jews (cf. the Phineas episode, discussed at *c. Iul.* 5.13–23).
[199] This may be an allusion to Constantine's execution of the pagan philosopher Sopatros (Zosimus 2.40.3) or violence against pagans in Alexandria under George's episcopacy (Ammianus 22.11).
[200] For a similar depiction of Christians attacking their own members, see Ammianus 22.5.4; 27.3.12–13. Theological and ecclesiastical discord was in a heightened state in the time leading up to Julian's composition of *c. Gal.*: e.g., the controversy in Antioch (Thdt. *H.e.* 2.7); the violence of George of Cappadocia against other Christians (Athanasius, *Fug.* 6) and his subsequent killing at Alexandria (Ammianus, however, claims that George was killed "by the whole populace" because he called a pagan temple a tomb, 22.11.7–8; cf. Cyril's quotation from Clement of Alexandria on precisely the same point of equating pagan temples with tombs at *c. Iul.* 10.21.2–23); and the destruction of temples under Julian's predecessors (Julian, *c. Her.* 22.228bc; cf. Sandwell 2005). At the same time, Julian speaks approvingly of pagan violence against the tombs of the martyrs (*Mis.* 28.357c and 33.361a).

actions are instead your own doing. For nowhere did either Jesus or Paul pass them down in their exhortations to you. The reason is that they didn't even expect that you would ever reach such a degree of power, since they were content if they should delude maidservants and slaves,[201] *and through them the women*[202] *and men such as Cornelius and Sergius.*[203] *But if one of the people well-known at the time should appear to have mentioned them – for these events occurred under Tiberius or Claudius*[204] *– then take me as speaking falsely about everything.*[205]

Cyril

6.32 Once more, this well-bred man speaks with an insolent mouth and says those setting sail from Greek deception and shifting anchor to the truth are impure. Well then, isn't this the ridiculous prattling of old women?[206] Come then, let's quote to him the words of his own elite ranks:

> You are mad, Menelaus Zeus-nourished, and there is no need
> [454] for your mindlessness; restrain yourself, though you enjoy it.[207]

Now as for us, in testing the habits of true "*purity*," we are practitioners of every virtue and are accustomed to consider a good reputation in all the most excellent matters something that ought to be pursued with an impressive zeal. But as for you, you all are so far removed from our approach that you admire your gods when they are licentious and you worship goddesses who are shameless courtesans. And yet he claims that we have succumbed to "*rage*" and have an unjust thirst for murder.

[201] For a similar criticism of Christianity as appealing only to those who are uneducated and lower-class, see Origen, *Cels.* 1.27; 3.44.

[202] On association with women as a point of slander, not only by Julian but against Julian, see Elm 2012, 459 with n. 87 (which notes Plato, *Tht.* 176b as a precedent). Cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* 81T Becker (= fr. 97 Harnack); *Phil. Orac.* fr. 343 Smith. At *Mis.* 35.363a, Julian chastised Antiochene men who did nothing to stop the piety and charity of their Christian wives and at *Ep.* 112 (p.192.19–20 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 46 [pp.142–43 Wright]) he complained about Athanasius baptizing noble Greek women. Similarly, at *Or.* 16.47, Libanius rebuked the Antiochenes for acquiescing to the Christian piety of their wives, mothers, and social inferiors. According to Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.16.1, Julian was especially annoyed to learn that the wives, children, and servants of many pagan priests were Christians.

[203] On Cornelius and Sergius, see Acts 10 and 13:7–12, respectively.

[204] On these two emperors, see Luke 3:1 and Acts 11:28, respectively.

[205] *c. Gal.* fr. 48 Mas.; Wright 1923, 376–77.

[206] Gk.: γραοπρεπῆ τερετίσματα; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.15.28–29.

[207] Homer, *Il.* 7.109–10; the final clause is given as κηδόμενός περ ("though it pains you") in editions of Homer (and several mss of Cyril), instead of ἡδόμενός περ (in the remaining mss of Cyril and as given in the text of the GCS edition, which we have followed in our translation here). Cyril seems to be the only author to cite these lines in antiquity.

Where shall we find that this has happened?[208] In fact, the opposite, I think, is true and is manifest on the basis of the facts themselves. For it was the blessed martyrs who were destroyed by them, although they hadn't been found guilty of any great evil at all and instead endured indictment because they had maintained their genuineness towards the God over all and been loyal to him.[209]

Moreover, why does he blame those who lay hands on their sanctuaries and altars and dig up[210] the workshops of their impiety?[211] And yet we heard him saying just a moment ago[212] that we ought to worship one God alone – for whom then did you all construct temples and set up the altars therein? For not even they would say that the divine is anthropomorphic, and yet, for some unknown reason, they contradict their very own views about it. For, having dedicated statues of diverse shapes and forms in their sacred precincts,[213] they would command them to worship them uncritically, while not unaware of the fact that they were honoring decayed corpses. If so, then[214] how is he not embarrassed to name Christ, the Savior of the universe, a "*corpse*,"[215] although he suffered in the flesh and for our sakes tasted death in order that he might restore human nature to incorruptibility? For he has not remained among the dead, but instead he came back to life after destroying the power of death and removing from us the corruption that tyrannized us due to Adam's transgression. [455]

6.33 Nevertheless, because women have believed and because domestic servants as well as some of those who are rather unremarkable in this life have been called, Julian does not permit the kindness of the Savior to pass without censure. And yet, would it not be better to hold the view that one human will not differ from another human in any respect, insofar as one is by nature what one is, but on the contrary a single definition of

[208] It is hard to read this line and not be reminded of the murder of Hypatia in 415 at the hands of a Christian mob led by one of Cyril's own clergy. If *c. Iul.* was composed after that grisly event, then one wonders how effective the above denial would have seemed to the first readers of the text.

[209] Cyril's response to Julian's accusation of violence enacted by Christians is similar to Gregory of Nazianzus' comments on Julian at *Or.* 4.98, where he also denied that Christians had ever used the violent tactics against pagans that pagans had employed against Christians.

[210] Gk.: ἀναβοθρεύοντας; a relatively rare word, which occurs in Cyril more than any other author, either in reference to overturning shrines by the pious or sin by Christ (*c. Iul.* 7.31.2; *Dial. Trin.* 6.613.44) or the attempts of the impious to uproot Christ's work (*Mal.* 4:1 [2.620.4 Pusey]; *Chr. un.* 722.21; *Ep. Fest.* 16.6.81).

[211] On the destruction of pagan temples, see also *c. Iul.* 7.5.1–10.

[212] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 47 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.25.9–10).

[213] For similar phrasing, see *c. Iul.* 4.8.25–26.

[214] This and the following sentence are cited in the *Flor. Cyrill.* 176 (185.7–16 Hespel). It also survives in Syriac in Severus' discussion of this florilegium. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 862.

[215] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 48.7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.31.9).

human substance[216] extends to everyone? "There is one entrance into the world for all, and equal are the exits," as it is written.[217] But some people sometimes have an advantage over others in externals, for instance in abundance of wealth, or in superiority of offices, and one person is a domestic servant, another is served. But, whatever is the case with these circumstances, all human beings have a single nature. And furthermore, a capacity for every kind of praiseworthy thing is inherent in human nature, since it is both wise and capable of distinguishing the worse from the better. There is, therefore, nothing preventing the person in a lowly position in this life from becoming wise, someone in a state of poverty from practicing justice, or someone with the rank of a domestic servant from showing himself to be kind and decorous.[218] Why indeed, therefore, does Julian bring a baseless accusation against those ensnared by the
[456] divine proclamation, who have been drawn towards the true and blameless vision of God and towards the knowledge of everything good, if it is not their lot to enjoy wealth, if they do not have advantage over others in external dignities? For my part, I would hold that the one in a state of poverty, if he should choose to live rightly and lawfully, is in an incomparably better situation than a wealthy person with privilege, and that a wise domestic servant is better off than a master who speaks nonsense. For it is written: "A wise domestic will rule over mindless masters."[219]

6.34 One might even see among the elite ranks of the Greeks that those who were especially distinguished beyond the rest, though they were at first people who worked with their hands and practiced a craft of common manual labor which they had inherited in succession from their fathers, nonetheless became not unremarkable in what they consider to be wisdom. I will pass over many people and go straight to Socrates himself, the son of Sophroniscus, whose mother was a midwife by trade and whose father was a stonemason, and indeed, they say that he even reached the highest point of his craft and considered the matter to be of no disgrace. Porphyry writes as follows about him, in the third [book] of his *Philosophical History*:

[216] Gk.: ὁ τῆς οὐσίας … λόγος; the notion is Aristotelian (cf. Aristotle, *Cat.* 1a1–12; *GA* 715a4–5; *Metaph.* 2.3, 998b12).

[217] Wis 7:6.

[218] The GCS apparatus suggests that the phrase "kind and decorous" (ἐπιεικῆ καὶ κόσμιον) marks an allusion to Plato, *R.* 1.331b1; however, ἐπιεικῆ stands alone in all the manuscripts of the *Republic*, the addition of καὶ κόσμιον occurs only in one manuscript (A) of Stobaeus' quotation of the passage, and the phrase as a whole occurs once in Julian (*Mis.* 27.356c) while being common in John Chrysostom and elsewhere in Cyril's corpus.

[219] Prov 17:2.

> Now that these matters have been thus clarified, let's discuss what others thought was worth mentioning about Socrates, briefly selecting those legends variously told by learned men for the sake of praise or blame, but nevertheless omitting as uninvestigated the issue of whether he worked in [457]
> stonemasonry with his father or only his father himself did; for none of this <chipped away at[220]> his pursuit of wisdom, as it was engaged in for just a short time anyway. But if in fact he was a Hermes-carver, all the better; for this craft is pure and not deserving of reproach.[221]

And after other things:

> For Socrates was a craftsman [Aristoxenus? says], having taken up the art of sculpting from his father. Timaeus likewise claims in the ninth [book] that Socrates had learned stonemasonry. But if the former [Aristoxenus?] is not a credible source on account of his hostility, while Timaeus isn't either because of his age – for he was younger than Aristoxenus – we should consult Menedemus of Pyrrha, who was both a student of Plato and older than Aristoxenus and says in his *Philocrates* that Socrates would never stop talking about how his father was a stonemason and how his mother was a midwife.[222]

Tell me then, did stonemasonry or being born of a father who was a stonemason do Socrates any harm with respect to his ability to accomplish what he thought was worthwhile? Did his birth from a working- [458]
class mother render the practice of philosophy inaccessible to him? For she was, as I said, a midwife.

6.35 Nevertheless, didn't the renowned Plato who is held in awe by them, after having consorted with athletic trainers and in the beginning loitering at the wrestling-grounds, pass from athletic exertions to philosophy? Indeed, Porphyry also says about him: "Plato was taught letters by Dionysius, but athletics by the wrestler Ariston of Argos. Some also say that he wrestled at the Isthmian and the Pythian games."[223] What, then, is more low-brow than such a life? For none of those who think rightly would, I think, bear to disgrace themselves, exposed and in the nude, with a bared body, before so great a crowd and no doubt for a small wage.

[220] We follow the GCS editors, drawing on Theodoret, who inserts ἐνέκοπτεν here; this verb marks a pun, which we have tried to capture in our translation, as "chip away at" (alternatively, "pound on"), which would be appropriate for a context of stonecutting. Oecolampadius' lost Greek ms perhaps read ἐνέκοπτεν, since he translated this as *Nihil enim hoc obfuit ei*.

[221] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 212 Smith; all but the initial clause of this fragment is also quoted by Theodoret, *Affect.* 1.27.

[222] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 213 Smith; alluded to (but not quoted or even paraphrased) by Theodoret, *Affect.* 1.28.

[223] Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 219 Smith; not quoted by any other ancient author.

Nevertheless, Julian says philosophy is inaccessible to domestic servants and mocks them if it is said that they have been called to the truth. And yet Zamolxis the Thracian was a domestic servant of Pythagoras and is, nonetheless, admired by them for having reached the acme of all knowledge. Porphyry has mentioned him too, and indeed even speaks in the following way: "He also had another youth whom he acquired from Thrace named Zamolxis; and, cherishing him, Pythagoras taught him the contemplation of the heavens."[224] Surely, therefore, nothing prevents domestic servants from being wise and good, provided they have chosen to endure "sweat for the sake of virtue"[225] and to be illuminated most rightly by the rays of the true vision of God.

6.36 Nonetheless, the fact that our divine proclamation benefits women – even this he turns into a pretext for his love of slander.[226] And
[459] yet even Plato himself when he put in at Sicily began to beckon Dionysius' wife to philosophy.[227] And Porphyry says that he both greatly admired Marcella for philosophy[228] and also readily took her into his home and chose to live together with her in marriage. And when expounding the life of Pythagoras, he also writes the following:

> He had such an effect on the city of Crotona that, after he had captivated the board of elders by many fair discourses, he in turn gave youthful counsel to the young men when invited to do so by the rulers, and then to the children who gathered in droves from their schools, and finally to the women – even an assembly of women was made ready for him. When these things happened, his reputation increased greatly and he took many disciples from this city, not only men but also women.[229]

Why indeed does Julian criticize the Savior's disciples for broadcasting the divine proclamation to all without distinction and calling both women

[224] Porphyry, *VP* 14, with some omissions. Cyril would have known this text as forming part of Porphyry's *Philosophical History*, the main source he has been drawing on for the past two sections. Origen had previously highlighted Zamolxis' training in philosophy in response to Celsus' critique that Christianity appealed to slaves (*Cels.* 3.54).

[225] Hesiod, *Op*. 289; this Hesiodic tag seems to have become something of a commonplace among Christian and pagan authors by the time of Cyril.

[226] See Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 48.11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.31.13 with note).

[227] As noted in the GCS apparatus, the above claim is found in no other ancient source, though at Plutarch, *Dion* 19.2, Plato's arrival in Sicily is said to have sparked "great excitement" among an unspecified group of women. Perhaps Cyril derived this bit of historical information from Porphyry's *Philosophical History*, which seems to have been his main source for this section.

[228] It seems that Cyril is alluding here and throughout this short sentence to Porphyry's own language at *Marc.*: "I *chose* to have you dwell in my home *together* [with me] (σύνοικον) … . I did not delay in *most readily* entering the contest of the marriage hymn … . *Having admired* your natural suitableness for the correct *philosophy*" (*Marc.* 1, p.273.3; 2, p.274.29; and 3, p.274.37).

[229] Porphyry, *VP* 18–19.

and men, illustrious and obscure, the wealthy and the needy, and surely even some domestic servants, to the duty of learning the identity of the one who is by nature the God, Craftsman, and Lord of the universe?

6.37 And, at a whim, he circles his insults back around against us, speaking as follows:

Julian

Nevertheless, I don't know what inspired me to utter this. But, to return to where I left off, what made you so ungrateful to our own gods that you deserted[230] *to the Jews? Was it because the gods granted to Rome an empire, but to the Jews only a little time to be free, and then to be forever slaves and immigrants? Consider Abraham: wasn't he an "immigrant in a foreign land"?*[231] *Consider Jacob: wasn't he a slave, first in Syria, then in Palestine after that, and then in Egypt in old age?*[232] *Doesn't Moses say that he "led them" from Egypt "out of" the house of "slavery," "with an out-stretched arm"?*[233] *And after they settled in Palestine, didn't they change their fortunes more frequently than the chameleon changes its color,*[234] *as those who have observed it say, at one time submitting to the judges, at another being slaves to foreigners? And when they became a monarchy – but let's omit for now how this happened, since God did not willingly allow them to have a monarchy, as the scripture states, but only after having been compelled by them and warning that they would fare poorly under the monarchy*[235] *– but nonetheless they inhabited their own land at any rate and farmed it for a little more than four hundred years. From that point on, they were slaves first to the Assyrians, then to the Medes, later to the Persians, and then to our own selves [the Romans] at the present time.*[236] [460]

Cyril

6.38 Now it is true that he has written such words under the possession[237] of the unclean spirit of this world,[238] as anyone at all who has a sound mind would, I think, affirm. For no one at all will accuse the [461]

[230] On their "desertion," see *c. Gal.* fr. 47.4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.25.6).
[231] The language echoes Exod 2:22; cf. Gen 12:10; 23:4.
[232] On Jacob's travels and servitude, see Gen 28:5; 29:18–20, 30.
[233] The sentence is a pastiche of biblical phrasing; cf. Exod 6:6; 20:2; 32:11; Deut 5:6.
[234] For this metaphor, see also Julian, *Caes.* 4.309a.
[235] Cf. 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 8:7–18.
[236] *c. Gal.* fr. 49 Mas.; Wright 1923, 378–79.
[237] As at *c. Iul.* 6.20.29 above, Cyril may be alluding to *c. Gal.* fr. 43.2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.15.4).
[238] Literally, "the worldly and unclean spirit" (τῷ κοσμικῷ τε καὶ ἀκαθάρτῳ πνεύματι) but we have rendered it so as to recall 1 Cor 2:12 (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου), which Cyril is certainly alluding to here; cf. *Ador.* 1 (PG 68.205a), where the passage from 1 Cor is expressly quoted after a reference to πνεύματι κοσμικῷ.

supreme and ineffable glory of God, if in fact they are in a good state of mind and heart, free from the inspiration[239] of the spirit of the devil.

But when he asks why we are inclined towards the irreproachable customs and laws of the Jews and "*deserted*" to their side, and also wants to learn the reason why we are "*ungrateful*" to his gods, we must say: "With the Jews, in fact, or rather, with the God-breathed scripture, we have found the subtle and well-chiselled <conception> of the true and only deity, which is full of every form of noble language, and we have found the laws and instruction that direct the lover of virtue straight towards every good, the exhortations of the saints that bring us to self-control, the promises of rewards, the true hope of life for eternity,[240] the forgiveness of sins, the abundant provision of the Holy Spirit, the grace of adoption – and which of those things beyond thought[241] and word haven't we found there?"[242] For it says, "Eye has not seen and ear has not heard and it has not entered into the heart of a human being what God has prepared for those who love him."[243] We have quite reasonably been ensnared by our appetite for these things into inevitably choosing them instead of the playthings of the Greeks and into loving the teachings of the God-breathed scripture.

And, furthermore, we are totally "*ungrateful*" to those who are, I
[462] know not how, believed to be gods. For indeed, although long ago they were conspicuous in the choirs of the holy angels, they have become wicked and apostate. And not "preserving their own authority,"[244] they slipped away from existence with God and, having entirely lost their intimacy with him, they have deceived the earthly realm under heaven and divvied up the inhabitants of the earth, and, plunging them down into pits of ignorance, they contrived for them to give up the better in exchange for the worse and rendered them lovers of every defect. They have persuaded people to worship not only themselves but also the elements of the cosmos and carvings of irrational animals, as well as birds and fish. Aren't we then justified in saying that it was our duty to be ungrateful to them and also that they have been the corruptors and abusers of all the land under heaven?

6.39 And surely no one would say that it is when we are deprived of abundant possessions that we are upset, but rather when we have been

[239] Cyril plays off of Julian's claim to "inspiration" at the beginning of the previous fragment; see *c. Gal.* fr. 49.2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.37.4–5).
[240] Cf. Titus 1:2; 3:7 ("the hope of eternal life").
[241] Cf. Phil 4:7 ("the peace of God, which surpasses every thought").
[242] For similar phrasing, cf. Cyril, *Is.* 61:10–11 (PG 70.1368c). [243] 1 Cor 2:9. [244] Jude 6.

injured in our wretched soul itself and are endangering it.[245] Accordingly, we departed from their supposed gods since we found among them absolutely nothing that did not deserve the most serious censure. For sex between males, prostitution of women, and the pursuit of every kind of licentiousness constitute their myths and mockery;[246] their mysteries are tall tales;[247] and in the rank of virtue are falsehood and every form of impurity, both of physical perception and of intellect. And not only is it by no means difficult to discover this, but on the contrary, as I said, the proof is self-evident. For behold, yes behold: although the God who prevails over everything is controlling the affairs of the Romans by his own will, Julian says that those who are not gods bestowed upon them their renown. Nevertheless, Your Excellency, I would say, how is it that those very beings who know how to go to such lengths of generosity and have granted to others the ability to rule have themselves been deprived of their own honor and glory? For the glory they stole long ago by their deception and lying they have entirely lost when Christ stripped naked [463] their falsehood. How, therefore, have they granted rule to others when they have been deprived by force of the ability to rule, have all but been buried in recesses under the ground, and are awaiting the time of inescapable judgment? For it says, "Those angels who did not preserve their own authority he cast into Tartarus and committed to chains of gloom, to keep them to be punished for judgment on the great day."[248]

6.40 Furthermore, since he also says the company of inspired Abraham were "*immigrants*" and under the rule of others,[249] let him now explain again what harm this would do them or how it would force us to have to think and say, absolutely and without exception, that they are not good. He has not yet shown whether they were shameful in character or whether they succumbed to unjust gain, or were slanderers, lovers of accusation, and cultivators of greed, envious, charlatans, and keen at working evil, a menace, and braggarts – these are the ones who are called before judges, these are the ones all the laws censure, these are the ones

[245] Cf. Luke 17:33.

[246] For life under the daemons as "myths and a cause for mockery," see also John Chrysostom, *Jud.* 1 (PG 48.854).

[247] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 1 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.2), where Julian uses the same word (τερατολογία) to refer to the "fairy tale" Christianity propounds. Julian himself admits the Greek myths are "unbelievable" and "fabulous" at *c. Gal.* fr. 4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.11), though he surely would have also insisted they have a deeper allegorical meaning.

[248] This quotation is, in fact, a composite of Jude 6 (already alluded to in part at *c. Iul.* 6.38.26–27) and 2 Pet 2:4, quoted similarly by Cyril at *Is.* 19:20–21 (PG 70.472d); 49:25 (PG 70.1080b); 51:22–23 (PG 70.1141c); *Ep. Fest.* 10.1.75.

[249] See *c. Gal.* fr. 49.6–10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.37.6–11).

fittingly prosecuted and subject to the indictments of their prosecutors. But being under the rule of someone, as strangers and foreigners,[250] does not in any way make them evil. Indeed, just look at the empire of the Romans extending over all the land under heaven: for it is not only the Jews that they have conquered but every nation and race of humans. Then should we say that, because the nations have been conquered and continue to endure submitting to their most lawful yokes, they are ill-bred and worthless? Has the fact that they are under emperors become an
[464] occasion of unexpected misfortune for them? On the contrary, no one would suppose this to be correct; for they are, yes, they are even now more than before in a situation better than they could have hoped for and abounding in all contentment, and we shall grant that the way things have turned out has brought them renown more than disgrace.

Julian ought, therefore, to release the company of Abraham from all accusation, indictment, and blame, even if they were foreigners and even if, having left the land that bore them, they migrated to another one and took possession of the whole of Judea by God's help. "But," [he says], "the children of Israel '*have been slaves*' to '*Persians*' and '*Medes*' and indeed also to some of the other nations who were their neighbors."[251] Do you, then, know the reason or do you want to learn it? For, since they left the pious service under God and sacrificed to their gods, they were deprived of all mercy and became the object of barbarian cruelty and submitted to the most grievous yoke of slavery. Therefore, it is right to be "*ungrateful*" to the gods of the Greeks also for this, for they save none of their subjects.

6.41 It will be beneficial to add the following to what I have said. Does it seem to Julian shameful and disgraceful that Israel was ruled by Saul contrary to the good pleasure of the God over all? It was, on the contrary, necessary and incomparably better, he will probably say, to be ruled by God alone. Well said! For his understanding is spot on and I shall agree with his words. Accordingly, it would be against God's will for anyone to withdraw themselves from being yoked under him and to submit the neck of their understanding to others instead of him. If so, then why does he, churning everything up from top to bottom, claim that God allotted universal empire to certain "*ethnarch*" gods and "*city-guarding*"

[250] For the application of the phrase (which otherwise recurs in the works of Philo of Alexandria and Plutarch, but seems to have precedents in classical tragedy) to Abraham in particular, see also Cyril, *Ador.* 1 (PG 68.172a; 68.184c); cf. *Glaph. Gen.* 7 (PG 69.348c).

[251] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 49.18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.37.20–21).

daemons,[252] despite the fact that God does not pass off to others the duty of ruling over the inhabitants of the earth but instead preserves it for himself in the way that he deems best? For when they asked for Saul, God was embittered and actually said through one of his prophets: "And I gave them a king in my anger."[253] [465]

6.42 Now all would agree that Julian is telling empty myths and, taking pride in the rotten ideas he has invented, he brings indictments against whomever he chooses for things that incur no blame. Nevertheless, acting like he hasn't been as irreverent as he should be against the saints and can't get his fill of slandering everything, this brazen man also comes against Jesus himself and says the following:

Julian

The Jesus you herald was one of Caesar's subjects. If you do not believe this, I will prove it a little later;[254] *or even better, it should be stated now. You of course say that he registered himself in the census under Quirinius with his father and mother. But what benefits did he cause to be bestowed upon his own kindred just by being born?*[255] *Well, that's because, so he says,*[256] *they were unwilling*[257] *to obey him. Why was that? How did that hard-hearted and stone-necked people*[258] *obey Moses? But Jesus, who ordered the spirits, walked on the sea, drove out daemons, and, as you yourselves state, fashioned heaven and earth – for in fact none of his disciples has dared to say this about him, except John alone, and not even he said so clearly or unambiguously, but for the sake of the argument let's grant that he said it*[259] *– was this Jesus unable to transform the choices of his own friends and relatives for their salvation?*[260] [466]

[252] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 26.3; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12; 4.40.4; 4.46.7–8).

[253] Hos 13:11a.

[254] In this comment Julian probably refers to the second book of his treatise, which was devoted to criticizing the gospels. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 64.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9), with a possible hint at the second book at fr. 51.3 Mas. (*c. Iul.* 7.1.14). See Riedweg, GCS 20, XCI–XCII and our Introduction.

[255] Adhering to the GCS text, we have not adopted Neumann's suggested insertion (followed by Wright) of an ἄνθρωπος at this point ("he became a human"), which was prompted by Cyril's words at *c. Iul.* 6.44.3 (γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος) just after quoting this sentence a second time, since Julian would hardly have accepted the doctrine of Christ's incarnation. Julian's reference to those akin to Jesus (τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ συγγενέσιν) might mark a veiled allusion to John 1:11 (εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον).

[256] On the ambiguous "he said" (φησίν) here, see the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).

[257] Cf. Matt 23:37 (καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε).

[258] Julian mixes biblical language here; cf. Deut 10:16 ("hardness of heart" and "do not harden your neck") and Ezek 11:19; 36:26 ("heart of stone"); Acts 7:51, drawing on Exod 33:3, 5 ("hard-necked" or "stiff-necked").

[259] Cf. John 1:3. Julian will elaborate on this point later in *c. Gal.* fr. 79–80 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1; 10.8) where he accuses the fourth evangelist of "surreptitiously" stating that Jesus was God.

[260] *c. Gal.* fr. 50 Mas.; Wright 1923, 378–81.

Cyril

6.43 As the prophet says, "The fool will speak foolish things and his heart will think vanities."[261] If, then, it had been someone else from the Greek herd who had confidently relied on such insipid arguments fit for old women, I would probably have said that, yes, possessing no knowledge of the sacred teachings they missed the truth – and likewise, they were totally unaware of the mystery of the only-begotten's economy[262] with the flesh. But since Julian, on the contrary, is so extraordinarily proud of himself and supposes also that he has mustered for himself a not unimpressive knowledge of the God-breathed scripture, he should hear from us: "You have a façade of wisdom, noble sir, and you think that whatever is valued among us humans is no doubt also held in high regard by God as well. But you are entirely ignorant of the separation, the transcendence of the divine glory, and the poverty of our reasoning. For if it had been altogether necessary for Jesus, being God, to take care not to
[467] appear to trail behind human fame and to join with us in aiming for these momentary paltry glories, for a modicum of success, and for pointless ostentation, wouldn't it have been better for him to bypass his mode of accommodation[263] and not become a human like us, given that he was enthroned together with the Father, adorned with the highest glories and illustrious in God-befitting dignities?"

Accordingly, if someone wants to make accusations and say, "Why hasn't he instead been designated a son of some emperor here on earth and indeed why wasn't he also born of a royal mother, born, that is, in the flesh?," that person should come forward to denounce the mere fact that he has become a man and has "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant."[264] For, if dishonor was entirely unbearable and onerous to him, although the timing and state of affairs were beckoning him to this, it would have surely been better for him not to acquiesce to the economy [in the flesh].[265] But, on the contrary, human standards were nothing at all to him as God and the scale of earthly empire was also insignificant to him, even though among us it is very well crowned with the highest honors. For example, when he was conversing with Pilate, he demonstrated clearly the highest transcendence of his own glory by saying: "My kingdom is not of this world."[266] Why, therefore, are you rebuking the one who is God by nature but nonetheless has chosen to endure the

[261] Isa 32:6a. [262] Gk.: οἰκονομίας. [263] Gk.: τὴν οἰκονομίαν. [264] Phil 2:7.
[265] Gk.: τὴν οἰκονομίαν. [266] John 18:36.

emptying in accordance with his mode of accommodation?[267] And yet how could anyone doubt that we [humans] are less than the wisdom residing in God to the same degree that we are also inferior to his nature? This, too, he himself says through the prophet Isaiah: "For my plans are not like your plans, nor are my ways like your ways; but as heaven is far [468] from the earth so are my ways far from your ways and your thoughts from my way of thinking."[268]

6.44 "*Nevertheless*," he says, "*what benefits did he cause to be bestowed upon his own kindred just by being born?*"[269] Simply put, all of them, even if some are disobedient. For this is the very reason why he became human, so that we too might be designated his family.[270] Consequently, for those on earth, what could be equal to such a thing in terms of the significance of its renown? We have been proclaimed participants in the divine nature;[271] we have been filled with the Holy Spirit, gaining intelligible intimacy with God[272] through [Christ]; he lowered himself to brotherhood with us, despite being God by nature, Craftsman and Lord of the universe; we are designated sons of the God over all. So then, after all this are you actually asking "*what benefit*" did he "*cause to be bestowed* upon us"? Or perhaps such a special thing is considered by you trivial and worthy of no account? And if anyone happens to be numbered either with the children or brothers of one of the emperors on earth, would this person seem to you to have reached the pinnacle of the highest renown of all, while, on the contrary, it would be entirely of no benefit for us to be named gods and children and brothers of God?

6.45 "Nevertheless," he asks, "why wasn't he seen by those on earth ensconced in the seats of an earthly kingdom and indeed conspicuous with exceedingly lofty and supreme perquisites?"[273] You will learn then, [469] insofar as it is possible, the aim of his economy.[274] For the whole earth had gone astray and that which was pleasing to each person was a god and an object of worship.[275] In fact, some had worshipped creation and dedicated their service to the elements of the cosmos, while others fashioned their own gods. Therefore, the only-begotten Word of God appeared from heaven in a form like us, in order that he might persuade

[267] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς. [268] Isa 55:8–9. [269] *c. Gal.* fr. 50.6–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.10–11).
[270] Gk.: γένος. [271] Cf. 2 Pet 1:4. [272] Gk.: τὴν πρὸς θεὸν οἰκειότητα.
[273] Though Julian in the surviving fragments does not ask this question in this form, Cyril might be referring to a lost portion of the treatise or, more likely, is extrapolating from Julian's earlier claim that Jesus was one of Caesar's subjects (*c. Gal.* fr. 50.3–6 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 6.42.7–10]).
[274] Gk.: τῆς οἰκονομίας … τὸν σκοπόν.
[275] Cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 7.2, for the claim that humans deified their own desires.

everyone to pursue the truth and, as it were, to push through the fog and darkness of their innate ignorance to reach the light of the pure vision of God. And since the Craftsman of the universe wanted humanity to rule themselves and to be steered by their own acts of will towards what must be done, for this reason it seemed to Christ, the Savior of all, to be a good idea (and quite rightly so) for humanity, not with compulsion hanging over them but rather by persuasion, to be released from the shameful things of the earth and instead to choose a superior way by which one could reasonably become a better person. If he, therefore, crowned with a king's glory and possessing an irresistible authority, had ordered those on earth to believe in him, belief would no longer be the fruit of "full assurance,"[276] but instead a product of unavoidable and oppressive commands,[277] and he would arguably be like one of those who have been fraudulently honored with the glory of divinity by human decrees.[278]

But because he, as one of us, has adopted a restrained and submissive mindset and dispensed with human glory, and thus transferred to a better state those who have voluntarily attained a "full assurance" due partly to his all-wise teachings and partly to suprarational divine signs, Julian's indictment of his mode of accommodation[279] is ultimately no longer in order; but instead he is discovered to have spoken empty
[470] nonsense against Christ the ruler of all. For surely, he should not make the census a reproach against us, but along with this point should fully consider the following. The one who did indeed endure the census under Caesar along with us in fact also performed deeds that are beyond Caesar's power and, even more, beyond that of every human. For he raised the dead from their tombs, he rebuked raging winds, he crushed Satan with a word, and he accomplished other miracles as well. Therefore, while Caesar was recognized by the tokens of earthly rule and by extrinsic good qualities that were not substantially[280] inherent in him,

[276] Cf. Heb 10:22.

[277] See *c. Iul.* 8.48 where Cyril returns to this theme, as well as *2 Cor.* 10:2–3 (357.20–23 Pusey) where he extends the principle to the conversion efforts of Jesus' followers: "if some people disbelieve, we must not force them by beating them with clubs but must instead wait on their voluntary conversion to God."

[278] Gk.: δόγμασι. It seems likely that the above sentence is an allusion to the deification of emperors. While emperors continued to be honored with epithets related to divinity during this period, in an edict issued in 425 Theodosius took care to distinguish veneration of imperial images from the worship that should be reserved solely for the deity (*CTh.* 15.4.1), suggesting that he would have agreed with Cyril's concern over fraudulent ascriptions of divine status to mere humans.

[279] Gk.: τὴν οἰκονομίαν.

[280] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς.

Christ the master of all, possessing an intrinsic glory not imported from an external source, was recognized by the preeminence of his accomplishments and could even be considered the God of Caesar himself. For the fact that some people have bucked off his yoke and indeed even insolently lifted up their neck will in no way deprive the Emperor and Lord of all from rightfully ruling the universe; on the contrary, their unbridled behavior counts against them, while he prides himself[281] in his own superior qualities and would keep the glory of his preeminence over all unshaken.[282]

6.46 Moreover, his claim that "*He could not change the choices of his own friends and relatives*"[283] is exceedingly puerile, since it seems to me that he has forgotten, despite hearing it many times, that a human person is a voluntary being[284] and willingly goes after anything whatsoever that pleases him, given that the Craftsman of all thought this [471] was the best way for things to be, in order that those who have chosen to be doers of good might receive their due praise and those who go down a different path might justly be the object of everyone's mockery.

Now as for the fact that the only-begotten Word of God is also the Craftsman of heaven and earth and quite simply everything in them, even the all-wise John is sufficient proof since he says: "All things came to be through him and without him not one thing came to be."[285] And also the agreement of the other apostles on this will be of no less assistance.[286] For, in confessing once and for all that he is God, they were certainly also not at all unaware of the dignity of both his inherent power and his preeminence. In fact, the most sacred Paul calls Christ, who is from the Jews "according to the flesh," the "God over all" and says he is "blessed forever."[287] And furthermore, some of the other disciples, when they saw him coming on the sea itself, were not only amazed at the

[281] Gk.: ἐναβρύνεται; cf. 6.16.8.

[282] This sentence is no doubt intended as an answer to Julian's objection that Jesus could not persuade his own family to believe in him. However, coming right after a sentence that identifies Christ as the "God of Caesar," it might also be read as a veiled allusion to Julian's own rejection of Jesus' divine authority, i.e., Jesus preserves his rightful rule over the universe, regardless of whether an emperor like Julian recognizes that fact.

[283] *c. Gal.* fr. 50.13–15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.18–19, with slight transposition).

[284] Literally, "self-bidden" (αὐτόκλητος).

[285] John 1:3; notice that Cyril is here attempting to answer Julian's accusation that only John had claimed that Christ had fashioned the world, and this unclearly (at fr. 50.11–13 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 6.42.15–18]).

[286] Cyril will expand on this argument in *c. Iul.* 10.2–7. [287] Rom 9:5.

marvel but also made their confession on oath, saying to him, "Truly you are the Son of God."[288] How could the one who is like this not be the Craftsman of the universe, since the God-breathed scripture confirms it and the matter is not inharmonious even with the elite ranks of the Greeks themselves, as also our argument showed earlier in what was already said beforehand?[289]

[288] Matt 14:33.

[289] For Cyril's earlier argument that certain pagan authors had acknowledged that the Son (or the Word) was the Craftsman, see *c. Iul.* 1.35–50.

Book 7

7.1 His Excellency Julian has not only denounced the holy scriptures; [472] he furthermore speaks so impudently and has gone so far in his love of casting blame as to reach a point where nothing we do escapes his slander. Perhaps he thought doing so would bring him a good reputation. But some might well say about people opting for this mindset, "their glory is in their shame,"[1] as well, I would suggest, as that statement made in the voice of David, "Why do you, who are powerful in lawlessness, boast in wickedness? Your tongue has planned injustice all day long; […] you loved all the words of your deluge, your treacherous tongue."[2]

But, since he takes no account of such verses, he leaps at the saints. He even rises up against Jesus Christ himself, the Savior of us all, and says, [473]

Julian

Therefore, I shall also touch on these matters a little later when I begin to give a specific examination of the tall tales[3] *and intrigues of the gospels.*[4] *But for now answer me on this point: is it better continually to be free and to rule the majority of the land and sea for a full two thousand years, or to be slaves and live under foreign control? No one is so devoid of self-respect as to prefer the latter. Or will someone, on the contrary, think it worse to conquer in war than to be conquered? Who is so oblivious? If what I say is true then show me a*

[1] Phil 3:19. [2] Ps 51(52):3–4a, 6.

[3] Gk.: τερατουργίας. Cf. Origen, *Cels*. 1.68, where the disciples are compared to those who tell "tall tales" (τερατευσαμένους), as well as Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.6.4, where the gospel is said to be "a deceptive stage play" consisting of "children's stories." Julian used similar language in the opening of his treatise (*c. Gal.* fr. 1 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.2]).

[4] Julian's reference to "these matters" may allude to his criticism in the last fragment of Cyril's previous book (fr. 50 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 6.42.7–19]) where he castigated Jesus' inability to change the morality of his own friends and relatives. His promise to return to the issue was most likely fulfilled in the second book of *Against the Galileans*, which seems to have been dedicated to a discussion of issues arising from the gospels; see *c. Gal.* fr. 64.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9), as well as a possible hint at the second book at fr. 50.3–4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.8); cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XCI–XCII.

single general among the Hebrews like Alexander, a single one like Caesar.[5] *Surely there aren't any among you. By the gods, I know indeed that I am insulting these men, but I have mentioned them since they are famous. For those who in fact are not as great as Alexander or Caesar are not recognized by the hoi polloi, but each one of them is more admirable than all who have been [generals] among the Hebrews taken together.*[6]

Cyril

7.2 He is "oblivious"[7] to the fact that his argument digresses from what is pertinent and has, with utter folly, passed on to irrelevant topics. For he intended to show that the worship of the Christians is not undefiled
[474] and indeed that those who introduced us to the sacred doctrines did not attain the pure vision of God, but that it was the elite ranks of the Greeks who were close observers[8] of the essential matters and who have subjected both divine and human affairs to subtle investigation.[9]

If so, then he has incomprehensibly abandoned the straight path, has bid farewell to his stated purpose,[10] and is cast adrift upon the rotten and irrelevant contrivances of his mind. "But Your Excellency," I would say, "if the traits of others do not appear an equal match for the glory and empire of the Romans, if none among them have been noble and suited to command, dedicated to and trained in tactics, capable of prevailing in battles and wars and of overpowering the force of attackers – tell me, is this sufficient grounds for thinking it would be necessary and reasonable for you to vilify the pious and worthy doctrines of the Hebrews or the Christians?" Yet how is it not obvious to everyone that arguments about these two topics are entirely unrelated to one another? For if his argument was proposing to seek what sort of kingdom someone would not be off-target[11] in admiring, whether that of the Romans or that of the Hebrews, it would be straightforward and incontrovertible to state the truth, namely, that the God who rules the universe, because he was aware

[5] Elsewhere, Julian staged a competition between Alexander and Caesar as an exemplification of a contest between Greeks and Romans, with the Hebrews entirely omitted from consideration (incidentally both generals are beaten by the philosophic ruler Marcus Aurelius); see *Caes.* 16.316d; 20.319d–26.325c; 31.330a–37.335c.

[6] *c. Gal.* fr. 51 Mas.; Wright 1923, 380–83.

[7] An echo of Julian's words in the just-quoted fragment (at *c. Iul.* 7.1.21).

[8] Gk.: φιλοθεάμονας; cf. Plato, *R.* 5.475e.

[9] On "divine and human affairs," cf. *c. Iul.* 5.35.15–19 with note.

[10] Gk.: σκοπῷ. For the claim that Julian misses the mark or fails in his aim (σκοπός), see *c. Iul.* 2.35.4 with note.

[11] Gk.: σκοποῦ.

of what was going to happen in the future, granted to the Roman empire the ability to govern all, in order that every land and city and those distinguished in the sacred council chambers of the empire along with everyone else would worship him. One can see from the facts themselves that this has been brought to completion.

7.3 But since, as I said, his argument is dedicated to investigating[12] our divine doctrines and the question of whether that which is true and above reproach resides among us or them, why does Julian mix what is [475] unmixable and attempt to treat topics that have no relation to one another as though they were the same? So what if the government of the Hebrews has been taken over and now submits to the laws of the Romans? Would this show them to be evil, misled, and incorrect in their doctrine of God? Yet as for living under the ordinance of laws and being required to submit to the supremacy of rulers, if this is something that brings shame upon some people, then haven't those who desire to rule mistreated those over whom they rule? And furthermore, since Julian himself was numbered among the rulers, why didn't he cease from greediness [for power],[13] if the requirement to be subordinate is harmful for those who have been subjugated?

In my own opinion one should blame the laws least of all; rather, it would be nothing extraordinary – and I claim instead that it would even be necessary – to bring an indictment for unholiness against those practiced in shaking off any intention of living under the laws. So, if guidance by laws towards a wholly praiseworthy life is something beneficial, why then did Julian slander living under their command? For it wasn't plausible that all those on earth should revel in the insignia of empire, since in that case where would the subordinate [class] be? Nevertheless, he makes this matter an excuse for reproaching even Christ himself.[14] Then how does he fail to recognize that it was for the sake of the economy[15] with the flesh that even Christ himself submitted to the laws that came through Moses, although he himself was the lawgiver and declared through angels the commandment given through Moses? For example, he said through one of the holy prophets, "I myself am the one who speaks, I am present."[16] **7.4** Nevertheless, the one who yielded to the laws of Moses for a time, as was necessary, who tolerated, as you say, the

[12] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[13] Gk.: τὴν πλεονεξίαν. Cyril possibly alludes to Julian's failed invasion of Persia (recorded in Ammianus 23.2–25.3); for a contemporary Christian reaction to Julian's Persian campaign, see Ephrem the Syrian's *Hymns against Julian* (with discussion in Griffith 1987).

[14] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 50.3–6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.7–10). [15] Gk.: οἰκονομίας. [16] Isa 52:6.

most servile census of Quirinius under Caesar, has become Emperor of the realm under heaven and is served even by Caesar's royal insignia
[476] themselves and he crowns those allotted to hold them.

The Macedonian [Alexander the Great] was a very brave general and has been admired by all, and after him Caesar and certainly some others were as well – I don't begrudge them. But they were neither pious nor indeed trained in the doctrines of the true vision of God; they too have erred, honoring the innumerable crowd of unclean spirits and venerating the gods made of wood and stone that were set up in their sanctuaries.

> *"Then how,"* Julian says, *"did the God of the universe allow those who were his enemies to arrive at such a degree of fame and to prevail over so many?"*[17]

So, then, you are blaming his gentleness and persecuting him for being long-suffering, and you have indicted his philanthropy. Do you accuse him, then, for other things as well? For he hasn't prohibited the sun from rising; he used to send showers on those who ignored him, provide gushes of spring water, and make the earth a fruitful mother.[18] For he knew, yes, he knew the conversion of everyone that would occur in the last times.

Accordingly, whenever the accuser of the Christians' worship says with the utmost stupidity, "*show me one general among the Hebrews like Alexander* or *like Caesar*" – then indeed, and with good reason, he will hear the following response from us: our argument, dear sir, is not about generals and those achieving this degree of distinction through physical bravery, but rather is about divine and true doctrines.

7.5 Furthermore, since he boasts in his own gods and says it was thanks to them that the aforementioned generals attained such a point of strength and certainly of fame too, his argument would first of all be impaired by a complete lack of support. For it would be impossible for
[477] him to prove his claim with facts, and the gods' inability to defend themselves when their sanctuaries were torn open, when their altars were uprooted, when every sacrifice was destroyed and their statues burned,[19] and, finally, when all the realm under heaven has come to consider them as worthy of no account – all of these occurrences would quite satisfactorily reveal that he is speaking nonsense on this point.

If anyone wanted, moreover, they could easily observe from the sacred scriptures that fearful and unconquerable ranks of enemies have often

[17] *c. Gal.* fr. 52 Mas.; omitted from Wright. [18] Cf. Matt 5:45.
[19] A reference to the destruction of the Serapeion? See Kinzig, GCS 20, CXV; Noethlichs 1986, 1168. On the destruction of pagan temples, cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 48 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.31).

been defeated by the God who rules all. When foreigners were marshalled against Judea and were bringing a harsh attack that was difficult to counter, the inspired Samuel sent up a prayer to God and made a great hailstorm descend from heaven that was so heavy and unbearable that the infantry fell along with the cavalry and handed an effortless victory to Israel and heaven mobilized its weapons, as it were, on behalf of those fearing God.[20] And the Assyrians, who at one time dwelt in the land towards the dawn and the [sun's] brightness, along with the Medes and Persians, besieged Jerusalem, and, surrounding the holy city once with a countless host, were threatening that they could burn it all without delay. But since the general – he was Rabshakeh – was uttering abusive[21] words against the ineffable glory, Hezekiah, being a pious king, was troubled and, being at a disadvantage, was beseeching God for aid; and indeed [478] there fell in one night 185,000 of the Assyrian army.[22] Has anything like this been done by Julian's gods – if, as I said, they actually exist? Instead, they are not even able to help themselves as the very facts confirm.

7.6 But since he, in his role as a fellow-shieldsman for the doctrines of the Greeks, uses up every method and attempts to show that they are sound, introducing into the middle of his discussion brave men's deeds – even if some among them became experts in the practical arts they were nevertheless superstitious like him – there was no obstacle to him taking this, too, as proof that his [doctrines] must prevail, despite the fact that they are sick with an endemic lack of beauty and have failed to achieve the true vision of God.

Carrying his argument away once again from the straight path, he straightaway recalls other facts that he probably thought would enable him to show quite easily that Christianity[23] is inferior to the superstition of the Greeks and says,

Julian

> *But, as for the institution of government and the form of law courts, the administration*[24] *and beautification of cities, advancement in learning and* [479] *training in the liberal arts*[25] *– weren't these things brutish and barbarous among the Hebrews? And yet the wretched Eusebius maintains that they even*

[20] See 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 7:7–11.
[21] Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.2.7 (in reference to Julian, shortly after Cyril had first mentioned Rabshakeh as an analogy to Julian).
[22] 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 18:17–19:35. [23] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [24] Gk.: οἰκονομία.
[25] Gk.: ἐν ταῖς ἐλευθερίοις τέχναις ἄσκησις.

produced some hexameter poetry[26] *and he ambitiously claims that logic was practiced among the Hebrews, a term he had heard being used among the Greeks.*[27] *What type of medical art appeared among the Hebrews like that of Hippocrates among the Greeks and of certain other schools*[28] *after him?*[29]

Cyril

This, despite the fact that the multitude of arguments we have already used against Julian's claims have proven that the writings of Moses[30] are older than all the books of the Greeks together and every legislative document.[31] For he is seen to be the first of all legislators, and those after him who defined the most beneficial laws for their societies are highly esteemed when they have established any laws in agreement with his.[32] Which particular area of divine and human affairs did he pass over in silence? Did he not display the habits characteristic of devotion to God, the path of good order, and an unimpeachable knowledge of what to do
[480] and what not to do? Did he not commend every form of good deed, while defining appropriate punishments for each shameful deed? Did he not punish theft, did he not reject adultery and licentiousness, polluted and profane pleasures? Did he not moderate the habits of those called to rule? For he ordained that they be upright, wise, alert, superior to profit and all animosity, habitually mastering anger and wrath, maintaining an impartial judgment, but always measuring out justice in equal measure to those under their control and proceeding down a straight path in their laws. Why, then, does Julian dismiss books that are so venerable and ancient and grant the better verdict to what came last? Indeed, how could this not be an accurate description of what he is doing, in light of what I have said? For it is reasonable to assume that those who come last imitate and repeat the [teachings] of those that are older and were born earlier, not that those who came earlier imitate the [teachings] of those who came last.

7.7 Moreover, since Julian deems worthy of all admiration "*training in the liberal arts* and *advancement in learning*," which supposedly exist

[26] Cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.5.7.

[27] Cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.5.5. On these two passages from Eusebius' *P.e.* referred to by Julian, see Bouffartigue 1992, 300; Ritter 2020, 24–25; as well as the section of our Introduction on "The Argument of Julian's *Against the Galileans*."

[28] Gk.: αἱρέσεων; although here translated as "schools," elsewhere Julian uses this same term to refer to the "sect of the Galileans" (*c. Gal.* fr. 3.5 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.9.6]) or "your sect" (*c. Gal.* fr. 80.19 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 10.8.22]).

[29] *c. Gal.* fr. 53 Mas.; Wright 1923, 382–83. [30] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. [31] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.4–19.

[32] On the agreement of Moses' laws with those of other nations, cf. *c. Iul.* 5.2–5.

among the elite ranks of the Greeks, but names that of the Hebrews "*brutish and barbarous*," despite the fact that they have obtained God's law as a wise judge and a guide for whatever ought to be done, it would be reasonable for me to say that, insofar as it comes to the sound[33] and quality of the verbalized speech alone, while the Greeks hold the eloquence of their own language in high regard, in exactly the same way the Hebrews too hold their own native eloquence in high regard. Or [481] rather, if he censures the Hebrews for something, he should also disparage the strangeness[34] and difference in sound of the Romans' language, since it agrees in no way with that of the Greeks.

But whatever the case might be, this argument ought to be dismissed as overflowing with silliness, and we should look at something else. Should it emerge that an aptitude for eloquence and the use of a formidable ostentation in diction are traits specific to certain people, would they invariably be correct in their opinion about God and furthermore would they be noble in character, decent and temperate, reverent and just, and dedicated to the excellent life? Or is it the case that a facility with language can be found among many people who nevertheless lack a familiarity with the best opinion about God and cannot claim any distinction in terms of virtue? The facts themselves, I suppose, will confirm for us that this, too, is true. Why then is he so amazed and why does he crown with the highest honors those who possess a tongue affecting the Attic dialect and quite nicely shorn of all impurities but a heart that is darkened and estranged from the pure vision of God? Nonetheless, he prefers to blame and slander those ignorant of the Greek language, though they have been made wise by the divine laws and successfully achieved the truly desirable life. Does the divine then seek in us a mere brilliance of words alone? Does it take delight in subtle and well-honed tongues? Or does it look for and consider as a friend the one who is habitually well-ordered and pursues an excellent life? [482]

7.8 And I am delighted that he mentions Hippocrates and takes the other doctors' good reputations to be something that will help his side win an inevitable victory and pour down a tasteless flood all over the Christians' worship. Now, let it be granted that some of the doctors have also attained excellence in their art and were skilled experts in the requisite method for healing bodily illnesses: what, Your Excellency, would this contribute to a discussion about worship? Were there no doctors,

[33] Gk.: ἠχώ. [34] Gk.: ἑτερόθρουν.

then, among the Hebrews, since Hippocrates was among the Greeks? Begone with such bad ideas!

But since he only takes pride in this issue and raises his eyebrow against us over nothing important, I will attempt to give a reasonable account of this, too. It is true that, out of forethought especially for the weakness of our bodies, the Craftsman made "medicines from the earth";[35] for the sacred scripture has mentioned this as well. But our doctors, at any rate, have not needed any of the medicines from the earth; on the contrary, making use of a divine and ineffable power and activity, they used to enable those seized in death's snare to regain their life, they used to set lepers free from such a cruel disease, and, having done still other remarkable deeds besides these, they would be worthy of all admiration. What then is your Hippocrates or any later member of the Asclepiads seen to have accomplished like this? For the present I will omit speaking of the things done miraculously by the hand of the holy
[483] apostles: the lame man at the Beautiful Gate,[36] Aeneas in Lystra,[37] and other [miracles] besides these, which also surpass all speech and amazement.

7.9 I shall return to this topic again.[38] Now those women who are shameful and are accustomed to hire themselves out, even if they are ugly, get rid of any offending imperfection[39] with plastered-on makeup[40] and the artistry of beauticians.[41] And the adversary of our undefiled worship, although probably blushing at the Greek deceptions, nevertheless takes every route imaginable, borrowing from any source he can material that will aid these deceptions, in one place venerating the doctors while in another pursuing other people who, in his view, were wise and attained a well-deserved reputation for their wisdom. And indeed he also says,

Julian

> *Is the wisest Solomon anything like Phocylides, Theognis, or Isocrates among the Greeks? How could he be? If you were to compare the moral advice of Isocrates with Solomon's proverbs, I am quite sure you would find that the son*

[35] Sir 38:4. [36] Acts 3:1–10. [37] Acts 9:32–35.

[38] Cyril does not, in fact, return to the topic mentioned at the end of *c. Iul.* 7.8 in any of the extant portions of this text. Presumably his treatment of the miracles of the apostles occurred somewhere in books 11–20, which responded to Julian's criticism of New Testament material.

[39] Literally, "that which is painful [to look at]" (τὸ λυποῦν). [40] Gk.: ὡραϊσμοῖς.

[41] The comparison of Julian's attempt at seducing readers of his polemical work to the seductive tactics of prostitutes recurs at *c. Iul.* 4.1.9–11 and 6.2.2–4.

of Theodorus[42] *is superior to their wisest king. But, he says,*[43] *Solomon was trained also in theurgy.*[44] *So what then? Was it not, as they themselves admit,* [484]
because his wife seduced him that this Solomon came to serve our gods?[45] *O the magnitude of his virtue! O the wealth of his wisdom! He did not overcome lust, and the words of a woman led him astray. If, therefore, he was deceived by a woman do not say he was wise. But if you have come to believe that he was wise, then you should not suppose that he was seduced by a woman but that he served the other gods as well because he was persuaded by his own judgment and intelligence and by the teaching received from the god who appeared to him. For envy and rivalry don't even touch the best human beings, much less come close to the angels and gods.*[46] *But you fixate upon particular powers,*[47] *which it would be correct to call daemons. For ambition and vanity exist there, but among the gods there is nothing even like this.*[48]

Cyril

7.10 In a supremely cunning move, he has omitted all the others who were surely also revered and illustrious and attacks the life of Solomon. For just as those who have chosen to lay waste to a very well-designed city set their siege-engines[49] against those towers lower to the ground, so also he has driven past the renowned choir of the saints and goes against Solomon alone. But "a treacherous man will not catch his prey."[50] For if

[42] i.e. Isocrates.

[43] Julian could be referring to Eusebius (whom he had named at *c. Gal.* fr. 53 Mas., cited above at *c. Iul.* 7.6); after all, while Eusebius nowhere uses the term "theurgy," he gives Solomon the epithet "wisest" as here (see, e.g., Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.4.6) and then uses language that might easily have been taken by Julian as redolent of theurgical language: before giving the particular example of Solomon, he asserts that the Hebrews have "among themselves theosophists who, illumined by the divine light, discovered the truth and were enlightened" (*P.e.* 11.5.1), and, after noting that Hebrew prophets had their knowledge from "a divine ecstasy of a higher power and the inspiration of a divine spirit" (*P.e.* 11.7.1), quotes from biblical passages on Solomon's secret knowledge of the powers of precious stones, the natures of every living thing, astral phenomena, and the qualities of plants and roots (*P.e.* 11.7.3–5). It is, however, also possible that the φησίν ("he says") is another instance of the pattern of this verb being used in the fragments of *c. Gal.* with an unspecified, ambiguous subject. See the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).

[44] Gk.: θεουργίαν. [45] Cf. 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 11:4.

[46] Julian perhaps alludes to the famous Platonic dictum that envy does not exist among the gods (*Phdr.* 247a7).

[47] Gk.: τὰ μέρη τῶν δυνάμεων; whereas Julian had elsewhere designated the God of the Jews a "particular god" (cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 28 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.46.3–16]), here he seems to be referring to the souls of Christ or the saints (cf. Porphyry, *Phil. Orac.* fr. 345, 345a, 346 Smith), though he elsewhere accuses the biblical god of jealousy and envy (cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 17; 20; 30; 33; 36 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 3.29; 3.46; 5.6; 5.13; 5.28]).

[48] *c. Gal.* fr. 54 Mas.; Wright 1923, 382–85. [49] Literally, "city-destroyers" (ἑλεπόλεις).

[50] Prov 12:27a; notice that Cyril deftly quotes Solomon against Julian in the midst of responding to Julian's own critique of Solomon.

someone has slipped up and is discovered to have suffered an unexpected turn, this in no way will impugn the teachings of the Christians.[51] But since Julian says that, in terms of being wise, Solomon was inferior to his
[485] own teachers and not as sophisticated as they were, let him again learn that in the first place he was a contemporary of Homer.[52] For when the 160th year after the sack of Troy had been reached, Homer was composing his poetry and was speaking in tragic tones about the misfortunes of Troy. And at the same time, Solomon was held in admiration because he finished weaving his book of *Proverbs* and had established the temple in Jerusalem. Then, after a long intervening time had passed, in the fifty-eighth Olympiad, Phocylides and Theognis were both born,[53] and they also composed useful instructions, simply put and neatly phrased, such as both nurses for little girls and surely tutors, as well, might recite when admonishing young boys. Furthermore, we in fact agree that Isocrates was a sophist with natural talent. And surely if he has contributed anything beneficial for young men he ought to be praised for it, but he should yield the better verdict to Solomon who has written before him things that would, I think, also suffice to give both young and old the required knowledge of how to conduct themselves in an orderly fashion or likewise how someone might live splendidly, knowledgably, and in harmony with both divine and human laws.

7.11 Now if someone [like Solomon] out of lust slipped into inappropriate behavior, the accuser should not openly laugh at us, but should
[486] instead consider well that we do not typically number him among holy prophets nor indeed among apostles and evangelists. For while he was shrewd and wise, with claims to being the best, at least among those who lived throughout all the land of Judea, he nevertheless had been raised with the sort of wealth and abundance that would be typical of people in positions of such privilege, dining on Sybaritic tables,[54] awash

[51] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

[52] Whereas Homer's date is reported at *c. Iul.* 1.13.13–14, Solomon is nowhere mentioned in the chronological overview of book 1. As in book 1, Cyril is probably following Eusebius who stated that "some" dated Homer and Hesiod to the period of Solomon's reign (*Chron.* II, p.71b.4–7 Helm; p.177 Karst). Eusebius had, moreover, acknowledged uncertainty and debate about Homer's precise date and entertained the possibility he might have lived earlier, which Cyril chooses not to report (*Chron.* II, p.63b.9–11, 66a.9–26 Helm; pp.172, 174 Karst).

[53] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.15.

[54] Sybaris in southern Italy was given a reputation for its wealth and luxury (see, e.g., Herodotus 6.127.1; Philostratus, *VA* 4.27); "Sybaritic tables" (or "Sicilian tables," cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 1.46.34 Kaibel) had become a popular proverbial stereotype for gluttony among Christian and pagan authors of the fourth and later centuries (in Cyril, cf. *c. Iul.* 4.28.11; *Ep. Fest.* 14.2.21; *Ep. Fest.* 18 [PG 77.808c]).

with other advantages, and illustrious with the highest honors. The goad of hedonism[55] is perhaps more intense among those who have been so successful, and, when desire has been stirred, their mind will go after it with free rein, so to speak, with nothing to restrain it. For hedonism nearly always keeps pace with luxury, just as the sophist Isocrates himself likewise says: "Wealth is more the servant of wickedness than of what is good and fair."[56] It is to be expected, then, that the one against whom Julian levels his slander, who was so illustrious and elevated above everyone else, was rich and lived a life of luxury. If so, then why, dear sir, is it surprising if he was somehow tossed about and yielded to pleasures, being full of luxuries, wealth, and the haughtiness that comes from these?

Socrates, the son of Sophroniscus, despite being raised in philosophy, possessing little, initially gaining expertise in manual labor, habitually eating little, being unavoidably oppressed, it seems, by the most extreme needs, and "walking on the ground" (to use Homer's words),[57] nonetheless used to get "tied in knots"[58] with his wives, Myrto and Xanthippe, and he used to fall into the embraces[59] of prostitutes and lacked restraint when it came to shameful and quite loathsome impulses. Come, therefore, let us also say about Socrates: "*O the magnitude of his virtue! O the wealth of his wisdom! He did not overcome lust.*" [487]

7.12 Let Julian answer this question for me: Does he say that his supposed gods are wise or exceedingly stupid and small-minded? Well, if he contends that they are unwise, then he has accused his own gods of ignorance, but if, on the contrary, he contends that they are wise and quite full of understanding, why then do they lust and fall madly in love with beautiful young things, both male and female? Accordingly, I suppose someone might with good reason say in their case too: "*O the magnitude of the virtue* of Julian's gods! *O the wealth of* their *wisdom*! They

[55] Gk.: φιληδονίας; cf. *c. Iul.* 3.25.13; 8.36.21; 8.49.17; 9.11.14; 9.37.5.

[56] Isocrates, *Or.* 1.6. Note that Cyril here follows his stated principle in the last paragraph by highlighting useful moral advice in Isocrates. He thereby also uses the authority cited by Julian to undermine Julian's own critique of Solomon.

[57] Homer, *Il.* 5.442; the original words were addressed by Apollo to the hero Diomedes, warning him to not overstep his bounds as a mortal who "walked on the ground."

[58] Gk.: συνεφύρετο; while the term seems originally to have meant "knead together" in a baking context, it came to apply metaphorically to "pulverizing" one's opponent in a fight. Its employment as a sexual innuendo seems to be limited to the environs of Cyril (namely, Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1.464 [PG 78.437b]), though Josephus already gestures at such a usage (*BJ* 2.151). For Socrates' relations with his wives, see Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 3, fr. 215 Smith (= *c. Iul.* 6.5.6–14).

[59] Literally, "interweaving oneself together with" (συνεπλέκετο) a woman; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.19.7; 6.5.20; 6.7.3; 7.14.6.

did not overcome lust and the love of bodies, something I would regard as entirely worthwhile.

If indeed a person, despite being exceedingly wise, lived in luxury and has thereby fallen away from virtue, the teachings of the Christians[60] should not be mocked on that account. For, as I said, the accused is not held by us to be a prophet or for that matter an apostle or evangelist, but rather a man raised in privilege who due to luxury allowed his mind to become easily led astray into inevitably making the occasional concession also to natural impulses[61] in a careless manner.

Furthermore, Julian delights in Solomon's failures and indeed even says that he served the gods of the Greeks, having been carried away by the twitterings[62] of foreign women. Then, composing what he no doubt
[488] imagined to be a stinging and mischievous argument, he says, "*If he was deceived*, he should not be called *wise*; *but if* you say that *he was wise*, it would certainly be clear that his choosing to worship *other gods too* was an inevitable result of his *wisdom*, for which he has also been admired."

7.13 Now it is true that, on the basis of what he has written, we would both say and certainly think that Solomon truly was wise. And no one would deny that he has admittedly erred by serving the falsely named gods. Nonetheless, we maintain that he was carried away by his foreign wives. For a woman is a twittering[63] thing and is capable of bewitching those who have once been caught in her snares because her ally is pleasure, which overpowers the mind. Moreover, he was captivated when he was also at the very threshold of old age, with his mind all but past its prime and no longer at its original peak, but having, as it were, grown old together with his body.[64] For just as a child's mind does not like to
[489] suffer pain, so neither does that of an elderly person, and just as children run off with reckless abandon after any activity whatsoever and fail to examine their every inclination – "for youths always act thoughtlessly" as Homer's line has it[65] – so also the mind of a man goes past its prime. So then, when Solomon was still young and in the vigor, as it were, of his intellect, he built that renowned temple in Jerusalem and was driven to

[60] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [61] Literally, "leapings" (σκιρτήμασιν).

[62] Gk.: ψιθυρισμοῖς, which is Cyril's preferred word for old women's talk (cf. *c. Iul.* 3.7.18; 4.21.27; 7.12.17; 7.13.5; *Ador.* 1; 6 (PG 68.205b; 469b), in parallel with "mutterings" (ψελλίσματα at *c. Iul.* 3.3.4–5) or "chirruping" (τερετίσματα at *c. Iul.* 3.20.10).

[63] Gk.: ψίθυρον … τι χρῆμα; see Cyril's similarly disparaging claim at *Ador.* 1 (PG 68.205b): "For [a woman] is nearly always a twittering and extremely talkative thing that readily connives at deception [Ψίθυρον γὰρ ἀεί πώς ἐστι τὸ χρῆμα καὶ λαλίστατον, καὶ πρὸς ἀπάτην εὐμήχανον]." See also *c. Iul.* 7.12.17 above with note; *Mal.* 3:6–7 (2.606.4–5 Pusey).

[64] Cf. 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 11:4. [65] Homer, *Od.* 7.294.

accomplish things for the glory of God. But when he came to the very end and sunset of his life and was failing in both strength and intellect, Satan at last arranged a trap for him through his wives and carried him away from what was reasonable.

Moreover, the fact that the God of all was greatly moved against him and immediately issued a punishment for his offense would readily prove that he was not pulled down into apostasy and brought to the summit of vice on the basis of a revelation he received from God, as Julian contends. For it has been written in Third Kingdoms: "And it came to pass when Solomon had become an old man that his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God as the heart of David his father, and his foreign wives led his heart away after their gods. […] And the Lord said to Solomon, 'Because these things were with you and you have not kept my [490]
commandment and ordinances that I commanded you, tearing, I shall tear the kingdom from your grasp and shall give it to your servant."[66]

7.14 And what was it that was commanded to him and all those under the law? Not to marry [a woman] off to a foreign man. For he says: "You shall not give your daughter to his son and you shall not take his daughter for your son; for she will make your son apostatize from me, and he will be carried off to worshipping other gods."[67] Solomon, therefore, became forgetful of such a command and used to fall into the embraces[68] of the daughters of foreigners. "Therefore," [God] states, "because you paid no heed to the commandment I gave and, slipping into apostasy, served the gods of foreigners, and because, even though you knew that the creation is my servant, you have allotted it the honor and glory that are fitting for me and me alone, therefore I shall shatter your kingdom and give it to your servant so that you may learn what you have done from the very outcome that follows."

So then, when did the one who was so grieved [at Solomon's apostasy] reveal to him that he also ought to worship other gods? For Julian, hunting high and low for an explanation that he finds persuasive, shouldn't say, "*For envy and rivalry don't even touch the best human beings, much less come close to the angels and gods*."[69] There was no envy, Your Excellency. How could there be? Nor indeed do we assert that it was a result of jealousy that the divine and pure Intellect did not put up with [491]

[66] 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 11:4, 11. [67] Deut 7:3–4a.
[68] Literally, "interweaving oneself together with" (συνεπλέκετο) a woman; cf. *c. Iul.* 5.19.7; 6.5.20; 6.7.3; 7.11.25.
[69] See *c. Gal.* fr. 54.17–18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.9.23–24).

those who have fallen into error and were for some unknown reason eager to worship others, but it was rather the result of guarding the dictum:

> The rule of many is not good; let there be one ruler,
> One king.[70]

7.15 Since, therefore, "*envy doesn't even touch the best* men,"[71] as he himself says, it ought to make no difference to earthly rulers if anyone should operate outside the bounds of their kingdom and even more should choose to seize their honors. But in fact, Julian himself was not like this when he held the insignia of empire and would have punished quite bitterly anyone caught in an indictment.[72] Accordingly, that which we are able legally to possess could be acquired by someone else as well, without anyone being envious of him.[73] Jealousy in these cases would be promptly denounced – and quite reasonably so. But when those subject to [God's] rule have assaulted the very glory of God or even intended to rebel against it, they deserve to be punished without hesitation. And anyone with intelligence would not suppose that the God of the universe takes this course of action with "*envy and rivalry*" but rather in a most beneficial and necessary manner, lest the truth go unrecognized. For the Savior himself taught that it is life-giving to know blamelessly and without error who the Craftsman and Ruler of the universe is, when he said the following to his Father in heaven: "This is eternal life: that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you sent."[74] Accordingly, since it is agreed that it is life-giving to have clear knowledge of the one who is by nature truly God,
[492] no one should doubt that missing the truth and slipping away from the life-giving service will be filled to the brim with nearly every kind of evil.

7.16 Furthermore, I am amazed that he, being himself a worshipper of unclean powers or rather daemons, says, I know not how, that we "*fixate upon*" them.[75] It seems to me that what was uttered by one of

[70] Homer, *Il.* 2.204–05; also quoted at Cyril, *Ep. Fest.* 4.3.34–35. See also Ps-Justin, *Coh. Gr.* 17.2 (only line 204); Eusebius, *M.P.* 1.1; Theodoret, *Affect.* 3.2.5; Zacharias of Mytilene, *Amm.* II, 316–24 (on which cf. Champion 2014, 56–57).

[71] Again, aside from a slight transposition and substitution (which indicates that Cyril is quoting the clause from memory), the wording is taken from *c. Gal.* fr. 54.17–18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.9.23–24).

[72] It is unclear if Cyril is thinking of a particular historical instance or merely making a vague gesture; after Julian became sole emperor there was a military tribunal against Constantius' key supporters (a tribunal, organized but then sagely not attended by Julian, at which "Justice herself seemed to weep," Ammianus 22.3.7); for discussion, see Bowersock 1978, 66–70; Elm 2012, 64, 89.

[73] i.e., an individual has just as much right to obtain something that another person can lawfully and morally possess, not by taking that person's own possessions but by acquiring the same sort of possessions themselves, and this should be no cause for jealousy.

[74] John 17:3.

[75] *c. Gal.* fr. 54.18–20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.9.25–26).

those among the elite ranks of the Greeks applies quite well to each and every situation:

> … It is difficult, Pamphila,
> for a free woman to fight with a prostitute.[76]

Having no grounds for bringing charges against the manner of life that is by nature good, free, and beyond all defilement, prostitutes wipe the filth of their own reproachable deeds off onto those who are virtuous, letting loose their scurrilous and disgusting tongue against them. This is, I suppose, what His Excellency Julian strives after and indeed has chosen to do. For he exalts his own side while once more railing furiously at the God-breathed scripture and even daring to say,

Julian

Why do you snack on the teachings of the Greeks if reading your own scriptures is sufficient for you?[77] *Indeed, it would be better to bar people from their teachings than from food offered in sacrifice. For the person who partakes of the latter is not harmed, as even Paul says,*[78] *though the conscience of the brother who sees him might be offended as you, O wisest of all, say. But it is through these teachings that every noble creature nature has produced among you has apostatized from atheism. Hence, any person who had even a small fraction of natural capacity has very quickly undergone apostasy from your atheism.*[79] *Therefore, it would be better to bar people from these teachings than from sacrificial victims. However, it seems to me that even you yourselves know the difference in the insight found in your "God-breathed"*[80] *writings and ours "that belong to the evil one" and you know that no one can become a noble person – or even a decent one for that matter – on the basis of your writings. But, on the basis of ours, every person could gain mastery over himself, even if he were entirely lacking in natural capacity. And if he is naturally inclined and has in addition received education from our writings, he becomes a bona* [493]

[76] Menander, *Epit.* fr. 7.1–2 Sandbach; also cited by Palladius, *V.Chrys.* 94.12 (see Mitchell 2022).

[77] i.e., according to Julian's metaphor, while Christians claim their sacred texts serve as their main meal, they also "snack" (παρεσθίετε) between meals on Greek texts, which shows that their own literature is not really sufficient for their needs or satisfying.

[78] Cf. Rom 14:20; 1 Cor 8:13.

[79] It is hard not to hear in these last two sentences a reference to Julian's own religious experience. On his abandonment of Christianity and turn towards traditional Greco-Roman cult, see *c. Iul.* Dedic.4 with note.

[80] We put scare quotes around this and the following phrase since it seems most likely that Julian is sarcastically adopting tags that a Christian would use rather than providing his own labels, something he does elsewhere (cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 6.8–9 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.18.17–18]). Wright's translation ("your writings as compared with ours") misses the sarcasm, since it relies upon emendations to the text proposed by Neumann.

> *fide gift of the gods to humanity, either by kindling the light of knowledge, or <by establishing>*[81] *a kind of political constitution, or by routing many enemies and traversing many lands and seas and thereby proving he ranks among the heroes.*[82]

[494]

And after other things:

> *There is clear proof of this: Select children from all of you and furnish them with training in the scriptures. If they prove to be morally superior to slaves after reaching manhood, then you should consider me to be speaking nonsense and to be spiteful.*[83] *Then, you are so unfortunate and mindless that, on the one hand, you regard as divine that literature of yours by which no one could become wiser, braver, or gain mastery over himself, while on the other hand, the literature by which one might gain bravery, prudence, and justice you attribute to Satan and to those who serve Satan.*[84]

Cyril

7.17 "Hear, O heaven, and take heed, O earth."[85] For behold, the mouth of Rabshakeh[86] is again opening wide to attack[87] the glory of God and speaks "injustice up to the height"[88] as it has been written; nor, so it seems, does he consider anything to be better than his endless banter[89] against us. It is true that the God-breathed scripture is sufficient also for the required demonstration that those trained in it are wise, entirely trustworthy, and possess a fully competent understanding. And so,

[81] Editors have suspected a lacuna here. We follow Masaracchia's conjecture of καταστησάμενος.

[82] The notion of humans as "gifts of the gods" was anticipated by Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 37.4–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 5.33.3–5 with note), and Cyril's discussion of *c. Gal.* fr. 44 Mas., especially at *c. Iul.* 6.19.32 (see note *ad loc.*). Cf. Porphyry, *Phil. Orac.* fr. 345a.49; 346.18 Smith (= Augustine, *C. D.* 19.23), where an oracle from Hecate is said to have declared that Christians were denied "the gifts of the gods" (*deorum dona* or *ab diis dona*) by the fates; as well as Julian's recounting of the "blessings" bestowed by the gods on the city of Alexandria at *Ep.* 111 (pp.188.20–191.3 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 47 [pp.144–49 Wright]).

[83] Or, "to suffer from depression" (μελαγχολᾶν).

[84] *c. Gal.* fr. 55 Mas.; Wright 1923, 384–87. A similar sentiment was expressed in Julian's infamous "school law" which, in the words of Ammianus, deserved "to be buried in lasting silence" (22.10.7) and does not survive in any legal code (see Harries 2012 and cf. Julian, *Ep.* 61c Bidez = *Ep.* 36 Wright; at the same time *CTh.* 13.3.5 indicates Julian's concern over education). The "school law" prohibited Christians from teaching classical literature, since they praised the literature while denying the existence of the gods narrated therein; such hypocrisy could not be tolerated in a teacher, so Julian thought. On the school law, see Vössing 2020; Niccolai 2023, 152–55. The law received a good deal of Christian response, most notably Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 4 and 5; cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 18.52.

[85] Isa 1:2. [86] Rabshakeh: 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 18:17–35; cf. *c. Iul.* 2.1.15; 7.5.24–29.

[87] Gk.: κατευρύνεται; a Cyrillian neologism, literally meaning to "spread against."

[88] Ps 72(73):8. [89] Literally, "his painful tongue" (γλωσσαλγίας).

consequently, we stand in no need whatsoever of external teachers. But since "it is sweet to know all,"[90] therefore, we quite reasonably also busy ourselves[91] with the opinions of the Greeks, which they have collected on each subject and, above all else, on God. Having done so, we regard as a cause for laughter those who have chosen to honor myriads of innumerable gods, who venerate the crowd of unclean daemons, which is perhaps [495] unknown even to their own worshippers, and who have in their sacred precincts statues of many shapes and forms, which have been fashioned after the pattern not only of men and women but also of wild beasts, cattle, and creeping things, birds and fish. And I am not even mentioning creation, I mean the sky, the sun, the moon, and the other stars, to which they have assigned the divine and transcendent glory, confusing everything from top to bottom.[92] We find that those among them who speak about God have written about their own gods the sort of things that merely hearing about would immediately fill a person's mind with shamefulness and uncleanness.

7.18 It is, therefore, precisely when we "*snack on the teachings of the Greeks*," as Julian says, and then discover that there is great harm therein, that we become still even more amazed at the sacred and divine discourses, I mean the God-breathed scripture. What edifying thing is not stated there? For first – and this is more precious than everything else – anyone can perceive the words of the true vision of God flashing forth within it. But what's more, they are subtle, precise, and sublime, both lifting the mind of those undergoing initiation beyond everything created, and placing the one, transcendent, and ineffable nature in a [496] realm, so to speak, whose conception surpasses everything that is subject to the judgment of the senses[93] and even everything knowable and intelligible, that is, all visible and invisible creation; and they have preserved quite well for it alone the duty of ruling over everything else, and indeed also its ability for crafting and bringing into existence things that at one time did not exist, as though this were some splendid and exceptional prerogative, or rather its proper and natural dignity, a dignity that does not naturally belong to anything else. In addition to these things, it next introduces the habits of well-being, and it directs one towards justice

[90] Menander, *Epit.* fr. 2 Sandbach; this Menandrian allusion went unnoticed by the GCS editors, and we are grateful to Margaret M. Mitchell for identification of it and many useful insights on the rhetorical aims of Cyril here. See Mitchell 2022.

[91] Gk.: πολυπραγμονοῦμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[92] For the phrasing, see Euripides, *Ba.* 349: "altogether confusing everything from top to bottom."

[93] For the phrasing, see Plato, *Ti.* 28a2–3, cited earlier at *c. Iul.* 2.32.4–5.

with divine and sacred laws, and indeed it also establishes a clear path of all goodness for us.

7.19 We shall call to mind the holy prophets, who had no share at all in Greek learning and yet were holy, most pleasing to the virtue-loving God, and doers of signs that defy reason.[94] I shall now also turn to Moses the hierophant himself. So then, let [Julian] teach us who is wiser than him – or even slightly comes close? He was in his speech a Hebrew but he was marvelously well-versed in contemplation and in reasoning.[95] "Eupolemus" the historian,[96] for example, when composing books about him, "says" clearly "in his treatise *On the Kings in Judea* that Moses was the first sage and handed on to the Jews an alphabet," which was no
[497] doubt the one customarily used at that time; "the Phoenicians" obtained this knowledge "from them" since they were also neighbors of the Jews, and they transmitted it to the children of "the Greeks,"[97] when, that is, Cadmus lived among them and taught them the very alphabet.[98] Clement, an eloquent and learned[99] man who investigated[100] the depths of Greek literature like few before him, has given his own version of this story in the *Stromateis*.[101] Since, therefore, the very knowledge of the alphabet came to the Greeks from the Hebrews through the mediation of Cadmus, Julian – the one who dared to say, "*Why do you snack on the teachings of the Greeks if reading of your own scriptures is sufficient for you?*" – ought to lower his raised brow.[102]

7.20 Nevertheless, perhaps someone will say the divine scripture's diction is common, low-brow, and completely banal, while the writings of the Greeks are eloquent, abounding with charm, and furthermore, melodious. In response, then, we say that the writings of the prophets and of Moses[103] were spoken in the Hebrew tongue, and, in

[94] Gk.: λόγον. [95] Gk.: λόγους.

[96] The following sentence is a very close paraphrase of Eupolemus, fr. 1 Freudenthal (= Clement, *Str.* 1.23.153.4); we have used quotation marks to indicate the direct borrowings. Cf. Eusebius, *P.e.* 9.26, who likewise offers a close paraphrase of this sentence, although ascribing it to Alexander Polyhistor (which may indicate that Clement himself was quoting or paraphrasing without acknowledgement from Polyhistor's text, given that Eusebius purports to be offering a verbatim quotation; the situation is complicated by the fact that Clement, but not Eusebius, refers to the title of Eupolemus' work).

[97] On the metaphor of "children," see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.4.5.

[98] *c. Iul.* 7.19.8–15 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 862. [99] Gk.: φιλομαθής.

[100] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσας; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[101] While Cyril drew the first part of the previous sentence from Clement's *Str.* 1.23.153.4 (see the note on Eupolemus above), he must be alluding to other passages for his inclusion of Cadmus by name: cf. Clement, *Str.* 1.21.106.1 (= Eusebius, *P.e.* 10.12.21).

[102] *c. Iul.* 7.19.15–21 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 864.

[103] Gk.: τὰ προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ Μωσέως.

order that they might be intelligible to the small and the great, were transformed in a beneficial way into an easy and entirely accessible form of diction.[104] In contrast, if the writings of the Greeks have much [498] grandiloquence and discrimination in sound, they nevertheless have manifestly diverged from what is fitting and have erred from the truth, since they tell myths about so many myriads of gods while being entirely ignorant of the one true God by nature. And someone, if he were sensible, would praise not the person who knows how to be eloquent and is an expert in embellished words, boasting brilliance only in this very skill, but instead the person who might be seen to possess a less well-prepared string of words but nonetheless has the correct view, namely, the view about God the ruler of all, and is not a novice in any good habit but has access to every form of virtue, as easily as riding a horse.[105]

Indeed, anyone at all could "*gain mastery over himself*" on the basis of the God-breathed scripture, and indeed also become useful for bringing edification to others; yet by merely speaking with eloquent words on the basis of Greek learning, he will gain no additional profit at all that would contribute to his being pious and good, a lover of self-control and reverence. For as I have already often said, I find that their gods despise not a single inordinate action but bypass everything good to seek pleasures pertaining to shamefulness and licentiousness. I will refrain from saying anything further about what sort of person he will be who has learned that the beings he worships are apprehended in all the most shameful of deeds. But if Julian has allotted the requisite victory to the discourses of the Greeks because wittiness is widespread among them but not among us, he owes an explanation to the one who is curious for an answer to the following question: if someone poured hellebore in a golden cup while putting honey[106] in another cup not at all like it but instead made of the cheapest material, and [someone else] then commanded him to drain [499] freely the one that seemed best, would, then, that person, upon looking at the materials [out of which the two cups were made], give the better verdict to the cup that was worse? Or would he rightly condemn the one

[104] The latter half of this sentence probably refers to the translation of the LXX, already highlighted at *c. Iul.* 1.16.16–21.

[105] This phrase resonates with Cyril's liking for metaphors taken from the sphere of horsemanship; see, e.g., *c. Iul.* 7.11.11–12.

[106] Cyril may have chosen this analogy precisely because of the traditional metaphor of Attic eloquence as "Attic honey"; cf. Aristophanes, *Th.* 1192; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 1.60.21; 3.28.28; 3.59.23 Kaibel; Galen, *Comp. Medicament.* 12.633 and passim.

that by nature caused harm and prefer the beneficial one despite the fact that it came in the cheapest possible cup?[107]

7.21 But since Julian says it would be better for us to prohibit believers from "*Greek teachings*" than "*from sacrifices*,"[108] let him hear in response that while we are accustomed, for good reason, to scare believers off from the eating of sacrifices, we do not prohibit them from becoming conversant with Greek literature. If someone should want to learn the reason, we say that, since there is only one God in truth, we deem it odious even to know the mere name of the others and we believe it produces all loathsomeness. The all-wise Paul shall teach this as well since he has written: "For we know that there is no God except one and that no idol in the world really exists."[109] For, if some people think this is a game – or rather, they have even gone mad and become perverted in their mind – and they label "gods" whomever they happened to choose as they see fit and if they, in their error, have erected seated statues in their sanctuaries, we must not likewise join them in their mindlessness, both maintaining and thinking that there might be others who are truly gods besides the one who is by nature Craftsman of the universe. Accordingly, having entirely done away with the existence of the idols we say that there is no such thing as a sacrificial offering; we eat with a pure conscience, ascribing glory to God for having kindly given us the free use of all foods without punishment. But if anyone is weak in these matters and their mind is not yet healthy and robust but supposes that there actually is such a thing as a sacrificial offering, we stand together with the person who does not have a firm footing when it comes to the genuineness of their faith, like certain physical trainers who subject youths to exercise and gradually
[500] bring them to a fully developed proficiency in their discipline. Paul, for example, uses a supremely skillful mode of accommodation[110] when he says: "If I take part with thanks, why am I slandered for that for which I am thankful?"[111] Accordingly, to touch the sacrificial offerings themselves, if someone should happen to do this, will do no harm at all to those established in their faith. For, since the idol does not exist at all, so too there is no such thing as a sacrificial offering. So, busying ourselves[112] with the literature of the Greeks, we praise their turn of phrase and verbal elegance, but we stand aloof from the doctrines in them and incline more towards the holy scriptures; for the beauty of the truth flashes forth in

[107] Cf. Augustine, *Conf.* 5.vi.10. [108] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 55.4–12 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.16.17–26).
[109] 1 Cor 8:4. [110] Gk.: οἰκονομικώτατα. [111] 1 Cor 10:30.
[112] Gk.: περιεργαζόμενοι; cf. our note at *c. Iul.* 2.7.5.

them and they are packed with precise doctrinal knowledge and every form of good advice, which might enable someone immediately to become full of all virtue and quite well distinguished in the boasts arising from good works.

7.22 And when he afterwards objects and mocks the holy and God-breathed scripture for being written in the Hebrew tongue, one might, I suppose, say to him: "Your Excellency, will you then along with it condemn any other tongues, too, that happen to be estranged from the Greek tongue? And would you surely number along with them your own, which you in fact value so highly (i.e., the language of the Ausonians)?"[113] And yet, would it not be true to say that, if we chose to think rightly and reasonably, we would hardly catalog the Greek language as an invention of <Greek>[114] worship, but say that it was one of the tongues divided at a certain point by the ineffable power of God into the clamorous noise[115] of those who had erected the tower reaching to heaven? [501]

For the elite ranks of the Greeks understandably believed that they were the inventors of eloquence and have assigned to themselves[116] the works of [God's] indescribable power. But the blessed David curses them saying: "May the Lord destroy all the deceptive lips and those who say with a boastful tongue, 'We shall magnify our tongue, our lips are ours,'"[117] in other words, "We ourselves are the inventors of eloquence." So then, while tongues are gifts from God and arguably each one has a distinctive beauty, at least when taken on its own terms, we say that the Attic tongue is admirable in sound in comparison to them. But this very fact alone would not help its users become reverent and know the path of good living. Or do you not see those flute-players and cithara-players on the stage, who typically charm with their auspicious words those who love to hear their songs, but who nevertheless often belong to the ranks of miscreants and lead a life liable to criminal charges? Accordingly, someone might praise them on the one hand, since they have attained the zenith of eloquence, but, on the other, it would be reasonable for him to criticize them since they have not attached themselves to excellent pursuits.

7.23 Children trained in sacred scriptures, however, would straightaway find themselves among those who are most God-beloved of all, even if they are not seen to possess expertise in words. Yet he says that

[113] i.e., Latin.
[114] Following the suggestion of Vinzent, noted in the GCS apparatus. Cf. *c. Iul.* 7.23.17.
[115] For "clamorous noise," cf. *c. Iul.* 4.31.25–26.
[116] Literally, "to their very own heads" (ταῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν … κεφαλαῖς).
[117] Ps 11(12):4–5.

there is no difference between them and slaves, since they do not possess a fine tongue,[118] presumably positing that obligatory admiration depends on this attribute alone, while disregarding every other virtue through
[502] which one might both become a confidant of God and gain honorable possession of the highest glory. Therefore, he ought to explain whether you should admire a talented and very eloquent person even if he is morally disgusting, or rather a good and decent person even if he is not magnificent in speech. We have accordingly been educated in every virtuous habit on the basis of the sacred writings of the God-breathed scripture, and yet we borrow the discourses of the Greeks, making this material a kind of preliminary exercise[119] for the true education,[120] and, since we have not been trained in the language of the Hebrews, we have pressed the Attic tongue into service for the declarations of pious doctrines.[121] For, as I said, this tongue is a gift of God along with the others, and no one would say it is an invention of Greek superstition. For "all wisdom is from the Lord,"[122] as it has been written, and every word comes from him, since he is the giver of both words and their meaning.

7.24 He also attempts to assist the stupidity of the Greeks in another
[503] way when he speaks as follows:

Julian

> *Asclepius heals our bodies; the Muses along with Asclepius, Apollo, and the learned Hermes educate our souls; in the sphere of war Ares and Enyo join in the struggle; Hephaestus apportions and distributes skills pertaining to the arts;*[123] *and all these things Athena the motherless maiden governs along with Zeus.*[124] *Consider, therefore, whether we are not better than you in each of these areas, I mean the spheres of the arts, wisdom, and understanding. For [this is true] whether you consider the arts serving some need; or those that are imitative for the sake of beauty, such as statue-making, [and] painting; <or> the administration of the household;*[125] *[or] the medical art from Asclepius*

[118] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 55.21–23 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.16.36–37).
[119] Gk.: προγύμνασμα. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.11.4–5, where the same word is used in reference to Moses.
[120] Gk.: παιδείας.
[121] Here Cyril makes explicit his reason for adopting an Atticizing mode of expression in *c. Iul.*; for a discussion of his style, see Vaccari 1937; Riedweg, GCS 20, CLXXV–CLXXXVI.
[122] Sir 1:1.
[123] For the idea that Hephaestus and Athena are givers and presiders over the arts, see Homer, *Od.* 6.233–34; Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* frs. 16 and 20 Sodano.
[124] On these gods in Julian's thought, see Julian, *in reg. Sol.* 3.132ab; 22.144b; 31.149ab; *c. Her.* 24.237c.
[125] Gk.: οἰκονομικήν.

whose oracles are in every land, given to us by the god as a perpetual allotment. [504]
Often, at any rate, when I was sick Asclepius healed me by prescribing medicine. And Zeus is my witness in this. If, therefore, we who have dedicated ourselves to the "spirit of apostasy"[126] *have a better condition in soul, body, and external matters, why do you reject these things and march over to the other?*[127]

Cyril

It is, therefore, clear that, among his gods whom he actually admires, some are doctors by art; others are skilled in the realm of words, just like, to be sure, the best sophists are as well; others teach the business of murder, being both experts at slaughter and practitioners of cruelty; still others are craftsmen and inventors of the artisans' pursuits; and quite simply each of the aforementioned gods corresponds to what his nature is said to be and since each has been allotted only one activity, they could not, I suppose, be active in the rest. If so, then how could such beings be gods?[128] Indeed, who would dare to say that the divine lacks any of the best qualities? For it is all-sufficient, all-powerful, and perfect in itself, being complete in respect of each and every thing that would naturally be fitting for the highest nature.

7.25 Someone therefore could, I suppose, say, "If the son of Coronis is truly a god, why then, good sir, does he not heal the sick and why has he [505] not shown that his own nature is completely sufficient by supplementing it with other functions?[129] But each of the gods is active in a partial way and shows the respective technical knowledge inherent in each of them, since, as I said, some are doctors by art, others, too, are trained in handicrafts, still others are honorably trained in culture and words and are experts in military tactics. If so, then in what way is human nature inferior to them, or how could our experience fall behind theirs? For there are among us a very great many excellent teachers of the arts and sciences, or rather, to tell the truth, not a few of those among us would be superior even to the very gods of the Greeks, assuming that it is in the

[126] Julian here seems to sarcastically adopt the lingo of his Christian opponents, as he does elsewhere. Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 6.8–9; 20.19; 74.12–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.18.17–18; 3.46.22–23; 9.32.14–15).

[127] *c. Gal.* fr. 57 Mas.; Wright 1923, 386–89.

[128] In his *De civitate Dei*, Augustine likewise repeatedly ridiculed the notion that each of the traditional deities had been assigned some limited domain of knowledge or area of life; see, e.g., *C. D.* 6.1; 19.17.

[129] Asclepius was the son of the god Apollo and the mortal Coronis, whom Cyril will later describe as a "pitiful and insignificant woman" (*c. Iul.* 8.51.4–7). Julian has already referred to Asclepius as a god and "the greatest of Helios' and Zeus's gifts" at *c. Gal.* fr. 46 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.22).

realm of possibility for a certain person to have some share of, say, the healing art and yet be famous for military tactics and, furthermore, be illustrious and remain admirable in the other pursuits.[130] Do we not then have to conclude that the gods are to be given second place to our own ingenuity if they are well-suited to only one thing, while, as I said, one may see all the arts combined collectively in a single human being?

7.26 Moreover, Julian contrives yet something else, raising up a kind of insuperable assault tower against the more simpleminded, and he says the plaything of the Greeks is better than the pure worship of the Christians, presenting as proof the fact that there are among them some who are excellent painters, sculptors, and doctors. Well now, tell me, are you not embarrassed to have written these things? So, expert painters and highly skilled stoneworkers can prove that those who are not gods, but rather unclean daemons or even decomposed humans, are really gods! For he seems to me to have forgotten that Asclepius was struck by fire and lightning at Epidaurus, as we said earlier.[131] Perhaps he thinks
[506] that there is no Christian either among the excellent doctors or among the supremely eloquent, or among those who know how to distinguish themselves in military tactics. But, Your Excellency, if it was necessary to assign gods to all of life's pursuits, both in the arts and sciences, as their inventors or even as those obliged to teach them, what size of a crowd would be big enough to cover them all? For there are so many myriads of activities in this life and kinds of pursuits, going all the way down to the most insignificant of them.[132] Yet someone would surely see the unpleasantness of the Greek doctrines, provided that he has a wise intellect dwelling within him.

And Julian admires Asclepius for – to use his own words – "*prescribing medicine*" for him when he was sick, and he claims that Zeus knows this.[133] Then why has he presented [Zeus] to us as his "*witness*" for doctors and why doesn't [Zeus] himself heal the sick instead?[134] Or, perhaps [Zeus] has, along with you, admired the experts because he does not

[130] Some doctors in late antiquity did hold political offices unrelated to their training in the medical arts, but almost never do we hear of a one who held a military office; see Baldwin 1975, 91 nn. 37–38.

[131] See *c. Iul.* 6.23; 8.50.

[132] Cyril uses a very similar *reductio ad absurdum* to critique the idea of multiple creator gods at *c. Iul.* 2.49.

[133] See *c. Gal.* fr. 57.11–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.24.14–15).

[134] Cf. *C. D.* 3.17, where Augustine similarly mocks the idea that Jupiter was unable to save Rome during a plague because he did not know medicine, forcing the Romans to call upon Asclepius from Epidaurus instead.

know the [medical] art and perhaps Asclepius has prescribed the medicine just like, I suppose, some run-of-the-mill doctor? And yet, if he is a god, as you say, shouldn't he rather have released people from sicknesses in a godlike manner, not so much prescribing the same sort of medicine a person might use, but authoritatively ordering the afflicted to be restored?[135] Accordingly, someone would understandably be laughed at for saying that those who are skilled in one of the human arts or pursuits and who have obtained only a limited technical knowledge are gods.

7.27 Nevertheless, as for us, dear sir, we have worshipped the one true God and claim that he has given to human nature wisdom, understanding, and the use of all speech,[136] and indeed also a nature possessing a capacity for every single praiseworthy thing; and we claim that the sciences and the arts are inventions of the intellect. Accordingly, it would [507] be reasonable to agree that the Maker is the source and giver of all fair things to us;[137] but this man would carry us away from the truth by distributing each [of them] individually to Ares, Hephaestus, the Muses, learned Hermes, and Asclepius, saying that they have divvied up technical knowledge among themselves like some kind of assignment. As though he had sufficiently proven that the [doctrines] of the Greeks are better than ours because they know how to paint and, indeed, because they have been well-trained in masonry, Julian states, "*If, therefore, we who have dedicated ourselves to the 'spirit of apostasy' have a better condition in soul, body, and external matters, why do you reject these things and march over to the other?*" Lower your brow, Your Excellency! Your bombast on this matter is in vain and you have put forward a laughable objection. But let's yield for a moment to your arguments and concede that the painters, doctors, and masons among the Greeks are better than those among us; will this suffice for you as proof that the Christians have erred from the truth and do not know the God who is true by nature or the habits of the most excellent life? On the contrary, let him have many fine painters and stoneworkers and doctors; it is to us that the inevitable victory belongs, since we are crowned by truth itself[138] and consequently know the one who is by nature the generator and Lord of all.

7.28 But he who wants to keep none of these points in mind continues his questions and says, [508]

[135] "Authoritatively" appears to be an allusion to Christ in the Gospels; see, e.g., Luke 4:32.
[136] Gk.: λόγου.
[137] For the precise phrase ἁπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν, see Clement, *Prot.* 1.7.1.4; cf. Jas 1:17.
[138] Cf. John 14:6; *c. Iul.* 8.48.12–13.

Julian

Why do you neither abide by the Hebraic books nor love the law that God gave them? Instead, having abandoned the ancestral ways and giving yourselves over to what the prophets proclaimed, you apostatized more from their [teaching] than from ours.[139] *For, if someone should want to look into the truth about you, he will discover that your impiety is composed of both Jewish audacity*[140] *and the indifference and vulgarity that exists among the nations.*[141] *For by drawing not the most beautiful but the inferior from both sides you have woven a fringe of vices. For in fact, when it comes to the Hebrews they have exact regulations around worship and countless holy objects and observances requiring a priestly life and disposition. Yet, although their legislator prohibited their serving all the gods but a single one whose "portion is Jacob" and whose "allotted inheritance is Israel,"*[142] *– saying not only this but also, in my view, adding, "You shall not speak evil of the gods,"*[143] *– [nonetheless] later generations in their disgracefulness and audacity, wanting to wipe out all the reverence for the multitude [of the gods],*[144] *imagined that not ministering to the gods entailed blasphemy of them. And indeed, it is this alone that you have drawn from them, since none of the other practices are similar between you*
[509] *and them. From the innovation of the Hebrews, therefore, you snatched the practice of blaspheming the gods honored <among us>, while from our worship you have abandoned its piety and love for God, along with the reverence simultaneously directed towards every superior nature and devoted to the ancestral ways, and you acquired for yourselves only the practice of eating everything, "as the herbs of grass."*[145] *And, if I must speak the truth, you have endeavored to intensify among yourselves the vulgarity that exists among us (this, I suppose, occurs quite naturally in all nations) and you thought that*

[139] On this double apostasy theme, see *c. Gal.* frs. 3; 72 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9; 9.22), with "The Argument of Julian's *Against the Galileans*" in our Introduction.

[140] On the accusation of "barbarian daring" against Christians, see Porphyry, *Chr.* fr. 6.33 Becker (= Eusebius, *H.e.* 6.19.7), with commentary by Becker, 157–58.

[141] This sentence picks up the theme of Christians taking "defects" from the Jews and Greeks, which Julian had introduced at the outset of his treatise in *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9). See also *c. Gal.* fr. 47 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.25).

[142] Cf. Deut 32:9.

[143] Exod 22:27(28)a. This passage was also quoted by the anonymous Hellene in Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.23.1. Cf. Van der Horst 1993.

[144] Wright takes the designation to be a multitude of humans ("desiring to root out all reverence from the mass of the people"). We follow, however, the lead of Oecolampadius in seeing it as a reference to the multitude of the gods (*multitudini deorum*); cf. Proclus, *Comm. Remp.* 1.90.15–17 (πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὴν δημιουργικὴν μονάδα παντὸς ἐξαιρεῖ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν θεῶν, "for in the first place [Homer's theology] removes the demiurgic monad from the entire multitude of gods").

[145] An allusion to Gen 9:3b. Julian discusses Christian dietary practices at greater length in *c. Gal.* fr. 74 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.32).

your ways should also accommodate the lives of people of varied character,[146] *hucksters, tax-gatherers, dancers.*[147]

Cyril

7.29 Notice for me how he has again spoken nonsense at random and heaps up absurd indictments against us, as though he can say everything he wants without being refuted. For he claims that we wandered away from the books of the Hebrews and slighted the law although it had been given by God, while instead we concern ourselves with the proclamations that came through the holy prophets. Let him come forward, therefore, and show that the prophets' teachings[148] have been put forth in a manner [510] discordant with the writings of Moses. Only then should he accuse us of apostasy and indict us for wandering away from the sacred laws. But, if there is no disagreement at all between them, but rather both the prophets and the writings of Moses say the same things and anyone may see that they everywhere agree with each other, then he should stop unjustifiably persecuting us and that censorious man should instead free from blame and indictment those who have been convicted of nothing whatsoever. Indeed, one can see the holy prophets using the greatest number of words as they cry out high and low against the people of Israel for advancing to such an extreme arrogance that they even consider as nothing the law delineated for them by Moses and instead have turned to commandments of human teaching. But it is highly unlikely to think that the same persons who criticize certain people for slighting the laws of Moses would be caught doing so themselves. Hence, as I said just now, the prophets and law agree with each other. And since "Christ is the fulfillment of the law" and prophets as the God-breathed scripture states,[149] we have been guided to faith in him on the basis of what has been written about him in both the law and the holy prophets. And indeed, to the present day we continue honoring the prior declaration that came through the law and prophets and sprinting towards the very beauty of the truth by means of the worship rendered in types; and we

[146] Following the transposition of this term made by the GCS editors.

[147] *c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas.; Wright 1923, 388–91. Regarding the last line, Julian elsewhere implied that Christians were "hucksters" (*Ep.* 61c [p.73.11–12 Bidez] [= *Ep.* 36 (pp.116–17 Wright)]; cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* fr. 6.34 [= Eusebius, *H.e.* 6.19.7], with commentary by Becker, 158–59, who suggests Plato, *Prt.* 313c as a source) and "dancers" (if his primary targets at Antioch were the Christians; *Mis.* 8.342b; 10.344a; 14.346a; 18.349a; 21.351d; 28.357d; 31.360ab; *Ep.* 89b [p.172.21 Bidez] [= "Letter to a Priest" (pp.334–35 Wright)]).

[148] Gk.: τὰ προφητῶν. [149] Rom 10:4.

proceed directly to our goal and have come to know the savior and
[511] redeemer of the universe.

7.30 But the one who, so it seems, prefers absolutely nothing to his compulsive obsession with faultfinding states, "We shall find *the impiety* among you *composed of both Jewish audacity and* Greek *vulgarity*."[150] If, then, he supposes it is something admirable to be obsessed with faultfinding and to feel compelled to make groundless accusations at those whom it is doubtless more reasonable to deem worthy of all praise, then I say that he has been quite successful in this endeavor. But if, on the contrary, he assumes it is a good idea that proofs must in every case accompany any claims someone might make, I am unable to imagine where he got the idea of calling the worship of the Christians "*impiety*" or in what manner we have become emulators of the "*audacity*" of the Jews and lovers of the "*vulgarity*" among the Greeks. "Yes," he says, "for *the regulations* among *the Hebrews* and their *precepts are exact*, and indeed also *require* a supremely *priestly life*. But, because the law prohibits worshipping other gods except one only, you thrust aside and spit upon the duty of living lawfully and you *have snatched* only the practice of insulting the *gods*, despite the fact that the law clearly states: '*You shall not speak evil of the gods*.'"[151] When our book has proceeded a bit further we shall clearly display, when we discuss these topics with him, that our life is moreover both lawful and exact, honed to a straight edge,[152] and indeed also filled with all virtue, even if it happens not to be carried out in a
[512] Jewish manner by means of the worship rendered in types.[153]

7.31 Nevertheless, he ought to know that the law, or rather the Lord of the law, enjoins upon the people of Israel to dig up altars and to burn down the sanctuaries along with their seated statues. He spoke thus in Deuteronomy:

> These are the ordinances and judgments, which you shall be careful to do in the land that the Lord the God of your fathers gives you as an inheritance all the days that you live upon the earth; you shall destroy with destruction all those places in which the nations there worshipped their gods, those places which you will inherit upon the lofty mountains and upon the coastlands and under the thick forest; you shall utterly destroy their altars and crush their pillars and cut down their sacred groves and burn with fire their carvings of gods, and you shall destroy their name from that place.[154]

[150] See *c. Gal.* fr. 58.6–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.28.8–10). [151] Exod 22:27(28)a.
[152] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένος εἰς τὸ εὐθύ. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.
[153] Cf. *c. Iul.* 9.21–31; also already 7.29.26–27. [154] Deut 12:1–3.

Tell me, would the one who provoked Israel against altars and sanctuaries, saying that the gods in them must be burned to ashes, declare about them: "You shall not speak evil of the gods"?[155] And further, is it not right to think that the divine and pure Intellect would never err from what is reasonable and from what is especially befitting him, nor would he ever be caught at variance with himself and legislating contradictory things? Doing so is shameful and ridiculous even among us humans.

What, then, would the meaning of this legal command indicate? Or how else should the statement, "You shall not speak evil of the gods," be [513]
properly understood? Since the God over all honored human nature with the appellation "god" – for it has been made according to his image and likeness – the law applies the name "gods" to those who perform the priestly work of divine sacrifices and are greatly exalted on high by dignities surpassing others, inasmuch as they possess a life that is entirely good, reverent, and holy, and it crowns them with respect and with the highest honors. On the basis of the law's own words, we shall know that my words are not false but rather true and irrefutable by adding what comes next in the verse. For it has been written: "You shall not speak evil of the gods." And then making clear the meaning of the divine utterance it continues by saying immediately, "You shall not speak evil of a ruler of your people."[156] I maintain that the sentence, "You shall not speak evil of the gods," refers to this. For how could those who had been commanded to apply fire to the temples and the things in them have restrained their tongue [from speaking evil of the gods], being prevented from doing so because of the sacred utterances?[157]

7.32 Furthermore, since Julian also deems our indifference to fine dining to be a charge against Christians, it is necessary for us to respond to this point as well.[158] The laws declare exceptional deeds to be worthy of all praise, they highly honored the habits of good behavior, and they have placed the highest value upon those who have chosen to live in an excellent manner; but, on the other hand, they consider every

[155] Exod 22:27(28)a. [156] Exod 22:27(28)b LXX.

[157] In other words, the "gods" mentioned in the first part of Exod 22:27 are taken as a designation for human rulers mentioned in the second part, since it would otherwise make no sense for one biblical passage to call for violence against the gods' sacred things (Deut 12:1–3) while another biblical passage prohibited violent language against the gods (Exod 22:27[28]a). Cf. the explanation of this passage offered by Origen at *Cels.* 8.38 and Macarius Magnes at *Apocr.* 4.27.20–23. The passage might also be in view at *Cels.* 4.31 when Origen says the Jews referred to their human leaders as "gods."

[158] In addition to the ensuing discussion of Christian dietary practices at *c. Iul.* 7.32–36, Cyril will revisit this topic at *c. Iul.* 9.33–38.

form of badness to be corrupt and make every effort to render those who wish to live immorally[159] more prudent by threatening them with appropriate punishments. Tell me, whom do the laws call to account: those who commit adultery or those who eat? Whom do the laws regard as liable to punishment? Those who are greedy and disparage
[514] others, cheaters, cringing buffoons, and those accustomed to do the worst things of all? Or those whose practice it is to taste fish and meat freely, if it should be the right occasion for doing so? But, you will say, they are irreverent towards the gods, for they defile themselves when they eat. Tell me how this could be? Is, then, the refusal of certain foods sufficient for the purification of a human soul and for the complete well-being that is required, even if it should manifestly not be free from the passions that lead to vice and sacrilege, even if it should lead a life condemned by the verdicts of the law? Who would dare to say this? Wouldn't he deserve to be laughed at by those who are accustomed to thinking rightly?

7.33 Next, he owes us an explanation of the following point as well: Who is the Craftsman of the universe, the one who brought into existence animals that dwell on land and animals that swim and dwell in water? For, as for us, we say the Maker of all is the living, active, and subsistent[160] Word of God, and it is apparent that none of the things made by him is capable of causing defilement or is objectionable in its nature insofar as it has come to be by nature what it is. For it says, "God saw everything that he made, and behold everything was very good."[161] But they, on the contrary, would probably say the "*proximate*
[515] *Craftsman*" of the world commanded the gods made by him to fashion in addition the three mortal races; for this seemed to the Greek wise men to be the case.[162]

Why then would they have brought such despicable creatures into being and existence at all, creatures which would naturally lead to the genuine defilement of those making contact with them? For they doubtless should have instead prevented the birth of things that would in no way benefit the inhabitants of the earth, but would rather contribute to vice, defilement, and harm. Still more foolish than this is the following: those in fact who busy themselves with the positions of the stars,

[159] Gk.: ἐκτόπως. [160] Gk.: ἐνυπόστατον. On this term, see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.28.
[161] Gen 1:31.
[162] On the three mortal races, cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 9; 10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33; 2.43), and on the "proximate Craftsman," cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 18.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.6–7) with note.

according to their own thinking and audacious speech, depict in the sky a certain Capricorn and Pisces[163] and other animals, which are held to be loathsome by them and incur their own denunciation because of their extreme impurity.

We ourselves, therefore, acting excellently and most sensibly, have placed the highest value upon the duty of living rightly and blamelessly, and we condemn the practice of vice: we regard adultery, sexual immorality, false speech, slander, greed, and additionally the other vices as detestable, knowing that only these things could taint those caught in them. So, we refuse no dishes as profane; laying to rest bodily pleasures by acts of moderation and blunting the goad of the love of the flesh, our custom is to eat little and we say that living luxuriously in no way belongs among the most excellent practices. [516]

7.34 Furthermore, Julian thinks it right to liken us to "*hucksters, dancers*," and indeed even "*tax-gatherers*" ignoring the freedom of the Christians' worship and its meticulous approach towards each and every thing that ought to be done. For it is not the case that we have, in sheer stupidity, consulted the traditions of those accustomed to pointlessly blather and adopted a ridiculous mode of life, but instead, being tutored by divine and sacred laws, we have highly honored the habits of the truly good way of life. And we have called to mind Paul who wrote: "Food will not draw us near to God; we will neither be better off if we eat nor will we lack anything if we do not eat."[164] And indeed elsewhere he also states: "All food is good and none is to be rejected; for it is made holy through God's word and prayer."[165] "Hear and understand"[166] Christ himself, the master and legislator of the universe: "It is not what is brought into the mouth that renders a person unclean, but that which comes out of the mouth that renders a person unclean […] For from the heart come wicked thoughts, murders, adulteries, thefts, acts of sexual immorality. These are the things that render a person unclean."[167] [517]

Perhaps he will also invalidate such statements even though a consideration of necessary concepts supplies a good deal of support to this position. But he ought to teach us what are the grounds upon which it would be reasonable for him to censure those things that he finds objectionable (I know not how!), even though the common verdict of everyone, as well as their very own nature, testifies to the fact that they are edible and

[163] i.e., a goat and fish; for the restrictions on eating such animals (though goats are not mentioned) as impious among some peoples, see Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.61.7; Bardaisan at Eusebius, *P.e.* 6.10.5–9.
[164] 1 Cor 8:8. [165] 1 Tim 4:4–5. [166] Matt 15:10b. [167] Matt 15:11, 19–20a.

belong in this category of things.[168] I mean something like this: there is a very large number of different kinds of land animals, birds, and sea creatures, and nature defines the role that each one plays, since some are useless when it comes to being taken for food while others are good for this purpose. Accordingly, whenever one of these animals that deserves no criticism on the basis of its nature should be censured by them, [these accusers] ought to come forward and state the true grounds for their accusation; otherwise, they should know that, while imputing irrational habits to us,[169] they would themselves be unmasked as suffering from the disease of extreme irrationality.[170]

7.35 Furthermore, I am amazed that among them there are multitudes of those that appear to be gods (for I wouldn't call them gods), and they also differ in their mindsets and proceed without a unanimous verdict concerning everything worthy of praise or blame. And anyone might see that they rise up in opposition against each other, so to speak, and that what some of them regard as detestable yet others consider reasonable and acceptable. And yet, wouldn't everyone, no matter who they are, agree that something truly profane would not be such to some people while being clean to others, even if precision [in such matters] outpaces the human mind? But then if they are gods, as they nonsensically claim, they shouldn't have erred from what is reasonable or become ignorant of the truth. Why, then, don't they have a single view on everything, instead of one that is varied and torn asunder, which denounces the stupidity
[518] inherent within them?

But, perhaps they might say, "We have abstained from every animal and have honored the nonsense of Pythagoras."[171] We recall also that Empedocles, lacking all sense, has written,

[168] For "necessary concepts" in Cyril, see, e.g., *Jo.* 9:31 (2.191.7–8 Pusey); *Dial. Trin.* 4.542.39; *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.456d). The sentence as a whole seems vaguely to rely upon the originally Stoic "common conceptions" approach to truth in which it was assumed that if an idea is generally held by all humans or by all peoples (in a *consensus omnium*) then it must be true. Although Cyril uses the phrase ἐξ ἀναγκαίων ἐννοιῶν rather than the standard κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι, it seems that he has something like this in mind, since the following sentence refers to the "common verdict of everyone." For Cyril, Christ's spoken words cannot be easily dismissed because they cohere with the rationality shared by all peoples.

[169] Alternatively, "setting before us irrational habits [that they wish us to adopt]."

[170] On the rationale of this paragraph, cf. *c. Iul.* 9.34.15–30.

[171] Throughout antiquity, Pythagoras' name was closely associated with the vegetarian way of life (which was, in turn, connected with the doctrine of reincarnation of human souls into animals, as occurs below in this chapter of Cyril's text). Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 8.28. Two of the most significant (if belated) treatments of Pythagoras' biography and teachings were composed by Platonists important to Julian: Porphyry's *Life of Pythagoras* and Iamblichus' *The Pythagorean Life* (on which, see Clark 2000a, with bibliography).

I have already been at some time both a girl and a boy
Both a bush and a bird, and a glistening fish in the sea.[172]

Therefore, if they hold such opinions about themselves it would not be unreasonable to think and to say that they too were perhaps once girls and boys, and fish and birds; and it is, I suppose, an acceptable thing that they were born as ignoble girls, or perhaps even as one of those who dance upon the stage or one of those condemned for banditry who make a habit of doing what is for good people neither right to speak aloud nor in fact safe merely to consider! So then, the expositor of the doctrines that are, in their eyes, excellent claims that he had been Euphorbus who fought at Troy.[173] But, if it makes them happy, let them pointlessly rhapsodize about which ancient persons or what sort of winged creature or bird they say they were, and let them fill their life with wretched and musty narratives [519] and the most unseemly little fables, which might perhaps also be recounted by nurses anxious to charm restless babies fully to sleep.

7.36 Accordingly, as I said, there are a great many among us who have arrived at the pinnacle of every good and have reached such a degree of self-control, rushing forward motivated by their own goodness, that they even sometimes with youthful enthusiasm[174] choose to forego the very things most essential for life, I mean bread, and oil too of course, and choose to tame the inexorable needs of the stomach with vegetables and bitter vetches[175] and to drink mere water and to take such delight in the toils of asceticism that they consider there to be nothing better. And they have not criticized any food but instead take on great suffering in their endeavor, as I said, to cut off from the mind the impulse towards inferior things, to beat down the instincts of the flesh, and to fine-tune the eye of the mind so it can examine what is blameless and in harmony with the sacred laws.

By contrast, those caught in the grip of the ignorance of the Greeks, who with utmost folly say to themselves and to others, "Do not grasp, do not taste, do not touch,"[176] plunge themselves into other things that they no doubt should instead be putting far from their mind, assuming that [520]

[172] Empedocles, fr. 31 B 117 D-K (= D13 Laks/Most) (= Diogenes Laertius 8.77); among Christian authors also cited by Clement, *Str.* 6.24.3; Ps-Hippolytus, *Haer.* 1.3.2; Aeneas, *Theophrastus* 6.1–2.

[173] Namely, Pythagoras who claimed that he had previously been Euphorbus (a youth responsible for giving the first mortal wound to Patroclus at Homer, *Il.* 16.808–15 and already mentioned by Cyril in connection with Pythagoras at *c. Iul.* 3.21.4–6 = Porphyry *VP* 27); Ps-Hippolytus, *Haer.* 1.3.3 likewise pairs the preceding quotation of Empedocles with Pythagoras' claim to have been Euphorbus.

[174] Gk.: νεανικῶς; cf. Eusebius' description of Origen's "youthful" act of self-castration at *H.e.* 6.8.1–2 (νεανικῆς … νεανικώτερον).

[175] Gk.: ὀρόβοις (which were apparently inedible for humans anyway).

[176] Col 2:21.

they give any thought at all to true well-being. For, calling sexual activity "the gifts of Aphrodite," they make every effort to avoid offending the goddess, and indeed also practice the other acts of evil without being called to account, I mean sorcery and mingling with males – and this inside temples with the gods watching!

7.37 An examination of the evidence has shown that this was also attempted in our own times. For in the temples of Cronus the temple-wardens have been caught as thieves of marriages between free persons, while the god who is worshipped hunts for women they can violate. O, what tears – and how many – will suffice for the women hunted down! A woman who had been given a dignified upbringing used to be called from the virgins' chambers into the workshop of licentiousness, since, as they themselves used to say, the god made an oracular utterance and requested unlawful sex.[177] And what is unbearable in these acts and what is the most shameful aspect of all their vices is the following: this crime which is so terrible and is utterly shameful had been honored with such long-established custom and openness that not even the very men who had the legitimacy of their own marriages despoiled thought this fact should be kept secret; for a man was positively glad to send the wife who shared his bed off to commit adultery, while [Cronus], apparently indicting his own nature for being unable to commit bodily acts,[178] was pimping her out to others. For daemons are always loathsome and profane. Would it, then, be
[521] reasonable for someone to criticize those who taste pig or have eaten fish, or instead to criticize those who lure women into the net of adultery and do what is inappropriate in the very presence of the statues of the gods?

7.38 Julian attempts to accuse the Christians' worship of being fraudulent in other ways also, having written the following:

Julian

The fact that not only our contemporaries but even those who in the beginning first received the word from Paul were people such as this[179] *is clear from the testimony Paul himself provides when he writes to them. For I do not think he*

[177] The scenario depicted here by Cyril seems strongly reminiscent of earlier anecdotes of priests tricking well-born women into believing that they had found favor with the god and returning to the temple at night to sleep with the "god" (really the priest, who went unidentified in the darkness); see Josephus, *AJ* 18.65–80; Ps-Hegesippus, *de Excidio Hierosol.* 2.4.

[178] Cyril makes an allusion to a version of the Cronus myth in which the god is castrated (just as he castrated his own father Ouranos); see Porphyry, *Antr.* 16.240–57.

[179] Julian refers to the moral coarseness for which he had impugned Christians in the previous fragment (*c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 7.28]).

was so shameless as to write to them about their many disgraceful deeds without being aware of what those very people had done. Mentioning these things ought to have him feeling embarrassed, even if he wrote so many praises of them, and even if they happened to be true; but if these praises were false fabrications, he ought to have slunk away, escaping the appearance of making his appeal with lascivious adulation and servile flattery. This is what Paul writes to his auditors about themselves: "Do not be deceived: neither idolaters nor adulterers nor effeminates nor those who lie with men nor thieves nor greedy people nor drunkards nor slanderers nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God. And, brothers, you are not unfamiliar with these things because you too used to be like this;[180] *but you washed yourselves, you were consecrated in the name of Jesus Christ."*[181] *You see that he states that they were* [522]
these sorts of people, but that they were consecrated and washed themselves, having obtained water which penetrates as far as the soul, sufficient to wash and purify them! And baptism does not remove leprosy from the leper nor blight nor pimples[182] *nor warts nor gout nor dysentery nor dropsy nor whitlow, and neither small nor great bodily faults. So, will it then remove adulteries and robberies and quite simply all the unlawful acts*[183] *of the soul?*[184]

Cyril

7.39 My noble sir, Paul was not accustomed to practicing adulation or flattery, since he was a minister of the truth. And, moreover, those who accepted the word of faith and received him as an initiator and mystagogue used to be idolaters and servants of wicked daemons, as well as unholy and loathsome in their habits, and they used to succumb to every pleasure – fornicators and those who lie with men, effeminates,[185] alcoholics, and practitioners of quite simply every form of wickedness. For it was not possible for them to appear holy and consecrated – those who, in following their own gods, have opened themselves to every kind of

[180] The phrase, "you are not unfamiliar with these things," is Julian's addition to the verse, which strengthens the point he is trying to make. Bouffartigue (1992, 163–64) raises, but does not decide, the issue of whether Julian recited these three verses by heart or was reliant upon a "curiously variant" text.

[181] 1 Cor 6:9–11. This passage was also subjected to criticism by the anonymous Hellene in Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.19.2–5.

[182] Following Wright's translation of Julian here; ἀλφούς otherwise designates "white leprosy" (s.v. LSJ).

[183] Gk.: παρανομίας.

[184] *c. Gal.* fr. 59 Mas.; Wright 1923, 390–93. Julian will again highlight the morally debased behavior of Christians at *c. Gal.* 86 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.34), a criticism previously voiced by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 3.59). See also his criticism of baptism at *Caes.* 38.336ab, with discussion at Nesselrath 2020b, 10–12.

[185] For this vice list, see 1 Cor 6:9–11, quoted above by Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 59.11–14 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.38.13–16).

accusation lest they should appear better than the ones they worshipped by their zeal to live in a self-controlled and virtuous manner and by their
[523] eagerness to outrun every fault! Therefore, Your Excellency, so long as they were servants of your gods, the wretches continued to wallow about like pigs in the mud of sin. However, once they departed from the daemonic error and dispelled the darkness of deception from their mind, and once they had been enriched with the light of the true vision of God and had come to know the sovereign Emperor and Lord of the universe (namely Christ), only then, at that time, did they wash off all their filth and opt for what is entirely praiseworthy instead of what is more disgraceful, and only then were they called to the holy life in Christ, namely the evangelical life. Since the all-wise Paul, therefore, was an "apostle to the nations,"[186] catching many in the net of faith and extricating them from the snare of the devil, he used to regard this as a lesson essential to their benefit, namely that one must make virtue an accompaniment to faith and must reject error along with the conduct that comes with it, I mean sexual immorality, adultery, mingling with males, and the other vices. He quite rightly affirmed that in this way the kingdom of heaven would be accessible to them.

7.40 Furthermore, if Julian thinks one must bring a baseless accusation against our Lord Jesus Christ for accepting wicked people and idolaters,[187] he ought to explain to an inquisitive person whether they must remain
[524] unshakably rooted in their vices and in no way be manifestly better by coming back from such reproachable habits, or should choose to think in a better way and attempt with all their strength to attain the entirely good life. Well, someone would, I think, say that it was doubtless better for them to let go of shameful deeds and treat vices as worthless, and to shift to a better course and cultivate the life in Christ that is worth imitating. Why then does he accuse Christ for saving those who were ruined and, extending his saving hand to them, raising them up when they lay in the dust, healing them when they were sick, and bestowing freedom from the passions in their heart? For he said, "I did not come to call the just but sinners to repentance."[188] And again: "The healthy have no need of a doctor but those who are faring poorly."[189] For whom would it be appropriate for

[186] Rom 11:13.

[187] Cyril will devote this entire paragraph to parrying a criticism from Julian related to Jesus, though in *c. Gal.* fr. 59 Mas., quoted just above in *c. Iul.* 7.38, Julian makes no mention of Jesus but focuses only on Paul. Cyril is probably responding to a portion of *Against the Galileans* he has chosen not to quote verbatim. Julian makes precisely this kind of critique of Jesus' free offer of forgiveness of sins at *Caes.* 38.336ab.

[188] Matt 9:13. [189] Luke 5:31b.

practitioners of medical expertise to heal, those who are ill or those who are free from sickness? And whom in the cities or country districts do the best generals usually free, those already caught and put in the status of captives or those surrounded by walls who have not yet become the victim of barbaric cruelty? For whom would the required washing be appropriate: those who are defiled, or if not them, would he say it is appropriate for those who are clean? And yet how would someone not rightly be mocked unless he says that such assistance is more appropriate for those who have suffered, not for those unacquainted with suffering? Why indeed, therefore, does he dare, as I said, to accuse the gentleness of our savior and indict him for loving humanity? He released those on earth from sicknesses, freed them from sufferings, rescued them from the devil's tyranny, [525]
and rendered those who were extraordinarily filthy pure and scrubbed clean.[190] Honor him with odes of thanksgiving and make the words of the prophet Habakkuk your own: "Lord, I heard your message and was afraid; Lord, I contemplated your works and was astounded."[191]

7.41 Nevertheless, Julian the wise takes as a pretext for mockery those things in which it would be better and more reasonable to take delight. Completely ignorant of the power of holy baptism, he sarcastically mocks the most venerable matters and says believers in Christ have been scrubbed clean once they obtained "*water sufficient to wash*."[192] He adds to these comments certain other insipid old wives' tales. For he says that the water of baptism is entirely useless for those with bodily illnesses and that we nonsensically think and say that it releases us from the filth residing in souls. But I would say, Your Excellency, saving baptism is certainly by no means taken by us as a healing of bodily sufferings, nor indeed does the mystery of Christ extend as far as matters that are perceptible and visible as you suppose and deem it right to think, but the account of it is quite subtle and deep and cannot be apprehended by the minds of those who are in error. And so, for instance, the prophet Isaiah says, "If you do not [526]
believe, neither shall you understand."[193] For faith is the beginning of understanding and our divine and venerable mystery has this as its entryway.

7.42 Therefore, to avoid betraying what is hidden to the ears of the uninitiated and so offend Christ who says, "Do not give sacred things to dogs nor cast your pearls before swine,"[194] I shall pass by the deeper

[190] For the phrasing in this final clause, cf. Cyril, *Ps.* 103:35 (PG 69.1268b). [191] Hab 3:2.
[192] *c. Gal.* fr. 59.17–18 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.38.19–20). [193] Isa 7:9; see Crawford 2014, 226–28.
[194] Matt 7:6. Cyril will similarly refrain from discussing certain topics with the uninitiated at *c. Iul.* 8.34.24–29.

things and now turn myself instead to those topics that will allow us to see that our enemy, who loves criticizing us more than knowing the truth, is stuttering about at random. It is not the bartering away of bodily sufferings that is promised by saving baptism. Hence, you should not be too surprised if it does not accomplish this. For, when we take into account his indescribable and supernatural power, we shall, without any difficulty and with nothing standing in our way, realize that, when Christ assents, the water will be sufficient for us even for this purpose. For is there any exceedingly marvelous thing that has not come to pass by his doing? What kind of divine sign has he not displayed? For by his all-powerful nod he made lepers clean, those suffering from dropsy he used
[527] to set free from this evil, and by his mere will he made the one maimed in both feet sound in limb and quite capable of running; for he leapt forth like a deer.[195] He ordered the blind man to wash his eyes in the waters of Siloam; when he did this, an unfamiliar light flashed in him and the deep darkness of his eyes was taken away.[196] Given that he effortlessly accomplished such exceptional deeds and instils his own efficacious power into the water itself, how could he not have displayed the grace that comes through holy baptism to be more powerful even than every bodily illness?

7.43 Nevertheless, we maintain the grace [of baptism] has been given to us for other purposes. For, after first removing from our minds the darkness of Greek stupidity, saying farewell to the herds of daemons, and with great wisdom spitting upon all their pomp and worship, we then open the intelligible eye of our heart to the light of truth, come to know the one who is truly and by nature the generator, sovereign Lord, and God of the universe, and finally confess our faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.[197] And as though coming to the beginning of another life and embarking upon the paths of true piety, we are justified as Christ
[528] gives an approving nod. For through him the Father is gracious to us. And, since the lawgiver justifies and releases us from every indictment, remitting the punishment for our transgressions, and furthermore since he sanctifies us intellectually through the Holy Spirit and transforms us – in a manner that he himself knows – into "newness of life,"[198] which is both self-controlled and virtuous, I could not tell you "who is the one who still condemns"[199] or what sort of dirt is still upon us. I might have

[195] An echo of Isa 35:6, "the lame will leap like a deer." [196] See John 9:1–12.
[197] This sentence draws upon the baptismal liturgy. For the rejection of Satan's pomp, see Cyril, *Glaph. Gen.* 5 (PG 69.284b); *Ps.* 44:12–13 (PG 69.1044b).
[198] Rom 6:4b. [199] Rom 8:34a.

said many other true things on this topic as well, confirming that the mystery was rendered beforehand in types by Moses and the prophets and is not something new, or something invented by us that has only just now appeared, except I was afraid, as I already mentioned, of the ears of the uninitiated.[200] For those things that most people have a hard time understanding nearly always tend to be mocked because they do not admit the impotence of their own mind. And they deem worthless those things that it would have been better to regard as worthy of all admiration, just as this most excellent man undoubtedly does as well. For when considering the extent of the mystery, he limits it merely to the sight of the water, although John expressly and clearly says to those who came for the baptism of repentance: "I baptize you with water, but the one who is stronger than me is coming after me, and I am not worthy to carry his sandals; that one will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire."[201] For he is comparing to fire, I think, the power of the Holy Spirit and the [529] cleansing activity he accomplishes within us. For just as fire, when it comes into contact with those vessels made from silver, melts down the filth clinging to them, in this same way, I believe, the power of the divine Spirit also frees us from every stain by licking at our souls like a fire – intellectually, that is, and in a manner befitting God.

7.44 As though he were reversing the nature of our situation to its complete opposite, Julian says that those who have been caught in Christ's net by faith in him and carried to the knowledge and worship of the one God who truly exists, are like captive slaves who depart from their masters' home and, greatly vexed at the yoke of slavery, suppose that running away will prove to be beneficial to them or, failing in that expectation, that nothing worse than what they've had can result for them.[202] But I would say in response that it is more fitting to liken them to domestic slaves who thought little of showing affection for their master, and indeed even rushed with complete abandon into apostasy and had an untimely thirst for an unlawful freedom. Then, having been caught in dreadful and inescapable evils and being punished with unceasing horrors, they fell without warning into bitter poverty, were oppressed by the lack of life's necessities, and were compelled to work for others as menial servants. But finally and with much difficulty, they settle on a better plan and come once again to prefer their original condition [530]

[200] Cf. *c. Iul.* 7.42.1–2. [201] Matt 3:11.

[202] Although Masaracchia included most of this paragraph as *c. Gal.* fr. 60, we follow the GCS editors in seeing this first sentence as Cyril's own loose paraphrase of some part of *c. Gal.* that has not survived (for distinctively Cyrillian diction within this paraphrase, see the GCS apparatus).

and run back to their first master who is good.[203] Or isn't it true to say that the only true God by nature is the generator and Lord of the universe?

7.45 Therefore, when it comes to those who worship daemons, if in fact they should choose to repent, the reasonable view would be to regard them not like people who have abandoned their own masters, but as those who have submitted themselves to God the master of all and been led to do so by the brightest expectations. For the gift of adoption is presented to them as a promise and they expect to obtain even the resurrection from the dead in Christ. But the enemy of truth mocks this most of all, in addition to everything else, as if it were impossible for the God who is all-powerful also to render superior to death that which, according to its own nature, is subject to the principle of corruption.[204] And this, despite the fact that Plato clearly depicted the Craftsman of the world saying to certain "gods of gods" that, though they are "not immortal" nor indeed "altogether indissoluble," they will not be dissolved thanks to his will.[205] And in addition, Plato has written that a certain Er of the Armenians returned to life although he was utterly destroyed and defeated by death.[206] For, perhaps it seemed to him, too, that the principle of the resurrection of the dead is correct and should be accepted as true. For the one who brought humanity into existence in
[531] the beginning, although it at one time did not exist, could easily give life to the one suffering dissolution from death. Indeed, to bring something into existence from nonexistence and to restore that which had fallen into corruption back to its original state would, I think, be the product of the same activity and a clear demonstration of it; or perhaps, to keep to precise and correct reasoning, the second would be inferior to the first. For I suppose it is a greater thing to bring into existence that which at one time did not exist than to restore again to its original state that which was already brought forth and had endured something unexpected. Since the one who is beyond every intellect is life and life-giving according to his nature, it certainly must in every way follow that there is nothing preventing him from transmitting life to certain people if he

[203] Cyril here riffs on the parable of the prodigal son; cf. Luke 15:11–32.

[204] The last two sentences (*c. Iul.* 7.45.4–9) were designated by Masaracchia as *c. Gal.* fr. 61 and probably refer to a lost portion of *Against the Galileans*.

[205] Plato, *Ti.* 41b; cited by Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 9.20–21 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.33.5–6).

[206] Plato, *R.* 10.614b–621d; cf. Origen, *Cels.* 2.16; Augustine, *C. D.* 22.28. Cyril has confused the information given at *R.* 10.614b3–4, where Er is said to be a Pamphylian and his father was a certain Armenias; cf. Clement, *Str.* 5.14.103.2 (cited at Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.13.30); Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.35.2; Theodoret, *Affect.* 11.43.

wants, since his activity is irresistible. But if some people disbelieve, since this marvel is beyond reason and is accomplished in some way that our minds cannot comprehend, they ought not overlook the fact that they will have this same experience in many other cases as well. For it is not possible to say how each of the created things, both the perceptible and the intelligible, or rather the visible and the invisible, have come to be; instead, it is appropriate that those things that leap beyond the limit of our minds should be honored with faith, at least among those who are truly sensible.

Book 8

[532] **8.1** Although the clever Julian undertakes a war against the ineffable glory[1] and lets loose the arrows of his own understanding against matters that transcend [our] intellect, nonetheless they all miss the target.[2] For he lies and boasts and makes mention of the God-breathed scripture, pretending indeed to know what is in it, but he is exposed as in fact understanding nothing at all, as an examination of the actual facts would demonstrate for us. For those who have recently been gathered together into "a holy people"[3] by their faith in Christ and who are also doers of good works and experts in radiant and admirable pursuits, these he has called defiled, extremely disgusting, pitiable, disreputable, good for nothing, and every other term of abuse like this![4] Moreover, as if this
[533] tirade against us was not enough, in still other ways too he tries to prove that we do not realize just how demented we are, nor indeed do we know how to walk straight down the path of truth, but that we, so to speak, jump off[5] the highway, disregarding the commandment delivered through Moses – and this entirely – and diverging from the views of Moses and the holy prophets who came after him. So he again writes as follows:

Julian

Now since [the Galileans] say that, although they are at variance with present-day Jews, they are nonetheless, to be precise, Israelites in accordance with their

[1] *c. Iul.* 8.1.1–2 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 864. On book 8 in general, see Boulnois 2020b.

[2] For the claim that Julian misses the mark or fails in his aim (σκοπός), see *c. Iul.* 2.35.4 with note.

[3] The phrase "holy people" occurs regularly in the LXX, e.g., at Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; Isa 30:19; 62:12; cf. 1 Pet 2:9: "a *holy* nation, a *people* for possession" (ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν).

[4] Cyril perhaps has in mind *c. Gal.* fr. 59 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.38), the final fragment quoted in the previous book.

[5] For the metaphor, cf. *c. Iul.* 5.8.5.

prophets and are persuaded[6] *by Moses most of all, as well as by the prophets in Judea who came after him, let us see in what respect they especially agree with them. It is necessary for us to begin with the writings of Moses, who, they say, proclaimed in advance the future birth of Jesus.*[7]

8.2 *So then, Moses, not once or twice or three times, but many times, deemed it right to honor one God only, whom he also in fact names "God over all,"*[8] *and nowhere did he deem it right to honor another God. Moreover, he mentions angels and lords and indeed many gods as well. So he had a notion of the first God who is preeminent, but not of another second god, either "like" or* [534]
"unlike" the first, such as you have concocted to add to him.[9] *And if there is somewhere among you a single word from Moses on this matter, you are obligated to bring it forward.*[10] *For the passage that reads, "The Lord our God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your brothers. You shall listen to him,"*[11] *certainly does not refer to the one born from Mary. And even if someone were, for your sake, to concede that the passage actually is about him, still Moses says he will be like himself and not like God, a prophet born from humans, just as he was, not from God. And the passage "A ruler from Judah will not be wanting nor a leader from his thighs"*[12] *is certainly not said about him, but about David's kingdom, which actually manifestly ended with King Zedekiah.*[13] *And in fact the scripture exists in two versions: "until there comes what is reserved for him" and your own falsification of it that reads "until the one for whom it is reserved comes."*[14] [535]

[6] On Christians being "persuaded" (πείθεσθαι) by Moses and the prophets, cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 1 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.2), where Julian speaks of his conversion away from Christianity as a process of being "persuaded" (ἐπείσθην).

[7] Celsus similarly criticized the Christian claim that Jesus fulfilled Jewish prophecies (see Origen, *Cels.* 2.28–29).

[8] In fact, the Pentateuch does not use this designation; see, however, Rom 9:5 (ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός) and Origen's use of the phrase at *Cels.* 8.4.

[9] Julian here reveals his knowledge of the so-called "Arian" controversy underway during his reign, alluding as he does to the Homoian party, who argued the Son is "like" the Father, and the Anomoians (more accurately called the Heterousians), who argued that the Son is "unlike" the Father with respect to essence. Cf. Hunt 2012, especially 257–58. Julian in fact had direct acquaintance with Aetius, one of the two prominent leaders of the Heterousians. See further the note at *c. Iul.* 10.26.

[10] Starting here and continuing in the next fragment, Julian cites four biblical texts taken by Christians as prophecies of Christ: Deut 18:15; Gen 49:10; Num 24:17; Isa 7:14. Although these texts were widely used in Christian literature, Marie-Odile Boulnois has pointed out that all four appear in book 1 of Origen's *Against Celsus* (1.34; 1.36; 1.53; 1.59), implying that Julian probably crafted his argument in response to Origen's earlier apology. Cf. Boulnois 2021.

[11] Deut 18:15, as cited in Acts 3:22. [12] Gen 49:10.

[13] On Zedekiah, the last king of Judah before the Babylonian captivity, see 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 24:18–25:7; 2 Chr 36:10–16.

[14] This passage had been used by Christians since at least the second century, as can be seen in Justin Martyr, who cited both the versions mentioned by Julian (*Dial.* 52.2; 120.3–4; *1 Apol.* 32.1–2). The first version, which Julian treats as the authoritative one, was the reading found in the LXX. Julian is correct that Christian authors did cite the alternative version as a prophecy of Christ (cf. Eusebius, *H.e.* 1.6.1–4), but they also had no trouble doing the same with the LXX rendering

It is obvious that none of these passages apply to Jesus. For he is not even from Judah – how could he be when, according to you, he came not from Joseph but from the Holy Spirit? For in recounting Joseph's genealogy you trace it back to Judah, and even this you were unable to fabricate well. For when it comes to his genealogy, Matthew and Luke are refuted because they contradict one another.[15]

Cyril

8.3 Well now, the fact that we who have been justified through faith in Christ are truly Israelites is shown by Paul, who was himself learned in the law and wrote, "For not all of those who are from Israel are Israel, nor are they Abraham's children because they are his offspring. […] Rather, the children of the promise are regarded as Abraham's offspring."[16] And in keeping with the promise, we ourselves are children of our forefather Abraham, inasmuch as we follow in the footsteps of his faith. So then, given that these children of the promise and they alone would be counted as Abraham's offspring, it follows that it would be appropriate that we too should unambiguously and truly be Israelites and be called such.

Moreover, when it comes to the question of whether the Christians' theological doctrines[17] agree with those of Moses as well as those of the holy prophets, anyone who wishes to do so can, without any effort at all, see that this is true. For we draw from that source, as if it were a spring, knowledge that carries us off to each and every excellent thing. Accordingly, this is what the God of the universe himself has also
[536] expressly promised to us, saying through the voice of Isaiah, "You shall draw water with rejoicing from the springs of salvation."[18] For he likens to life-giving water the sacred and divine word, which is poured forth by the springs of salvation, that is, by Moses and the prophets, as well as by the apostles and evangelists.[19] One should, therefore, be able to see that we have never stood opposed either to Moses' doctrines or to those of the holy prophets. For, as I said, we regard

(cf. Origen, *Cels.* 1.53; Eusebius, *D.e.* 8.1). On Julian's criticism of this dual textual tradition and Cyril's response, see Boulnois 2021, 287–304. Julian will again allude to textual diversity within Christians' sacred scriptures at *c. Gal.* fr. 67 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.2).

[15] *c. Gal.* fr. 62 Mas.; Wright 1923, 392–97. On Julian's last comment, cf. Matt 1:1–17; Luke 3:23–38. On the topic of Jesus' discordant genealogies, see the notes at *c. Iul.* 8.15 and *c. Iul.* fr. 75.

[16] Rom 9:6b–7a, 8b. [17] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [18] Isa 12:3.

[19] Cf. Cyril's exegesis at *Is.* 30:25 (PG 70.685) on which see Crawford 2014, 92–93; and *Is.* 33:20–21 (PG 70.733–36), on which see Russell 2007, 76–77.

them as instructors who offer us lessons in the doctrinal and ethical knowledge that leads to piety.[20]

8.4 Furthermore, as for the fact that Moses affirmed and has made manifest even to us that there exists one true God by nature, the Craftsman and Lord of things seen and unseen, this is something that no one could deny. For Moses portrayed him as clearly saying, "There shall be no other gods for you but me."[21] And once more, "You shall not make for yourself an idol or an image of anything whatsoever, whether those things in the heaven above, or in the earth below, or in the waters beneath the earth."[22] Furthermore, through the voice of the prophets he says the following, "You shall say to them, 'Let the gods who did not make the heaven and the earth perish from the earth and from under this heaven.'"[23] Additionally, "You shall know no God besides me, and there is no one who saves except me."[24] Moreover, the divine David at one point sings, "All the gods of the nations are daemons, but the Lord made the heavens."[25] [537]

Hence, because we follow the words decreed exceedingly well through Moses, along with the prophetic proclamations, we confess that he who is truly God by nature is one. And in addition to this, we know and believe without any doubt that "all the gods of the nations are daemons."[26] On what point then do we differ from these holy men? Or in what way do we rise up in opposition to their views, as though we thought or said something else? Let him come forward! Let him show us! This clever adversary of ours who denounces the truth should not inundate us with baseless claims. I am astonished that although Julian insists that the most excellent Moses "*not once*" but "*many times*" knows and indeed also confesses one God and no other at all besides him, he nevertheless dares <to say>[27] – how I do not know – that Moses mentions "*lords*" and "*angels*" and indeed also "*many gods*" and says that the first God is "*preeminent*" in comparison with the others. Yet for the purpose of doing away with the other gods, it will not suffice for the first God merely to surpass them. Rather, only if he himself is said to be and really is one by nature would it then follow that no one else is truly God along with him.

[20] The "as I said" of this sentence, could be referring back to the first two sentences of this paragraph (as the GCS apparatus suggests) or to *c. Iul.* 7.18, which Boulnois highlights (SC 624, 259 n. 3), but it might also be pointing still further back, since Cyril announced this theme at *c. Iul.* 1.17 and emphasized it again at 2.12.

[21] Exod 20:3. [22] Exod 20:4; Deut 5:8. [23] Jer 10:11. [24] Hos 13:4b. [25] Ps 95(96):5.

[26] For Cyril's extended discussion of this point, see *c. Iul.* book 4.

[27] The GCS text inserts λέγειν here, following the Latin edition of Oecolampadius.

8.5 Why, then, does Julian distort the Mosaic writings,[28] despite the fact that Moses clearly says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one"?[29] For Moses did not hold that it is right to think and say the one God over all is "*preeminent*" in comparison with others, but instead knew that, thanks to his incomparable superiority, he is lifted up on high in an intelligible sense, is beyond every intelligible thing, and is self-originate and alone ungenerated. Therefore, given that the Lord God is one and alone, how and on what grounds could anyone doubt that, even if some beings should be called "gods" and "lords" [by Moses], they have been dignified with a bare title, belonging as they do to another nature besides his own, a subservient nature, that is, which at one point
[538] did not exist and has been moved by him into existence? For example, the God of the universe bestows this property even upon us when he says, "I said, 'You are gods and are all sons of the Most High.'"[30] Does this mean that we who have received this honor and have been called "gods" as a gift from his kindness should ignore the finitude of our own nature? Hardly! For we regard being wise as a serious matter worthy of attention.

8.6 Now in due time, once our discussion of these topics has advanced a little further, we will show in turn that, even if Moses should speak of one God (that is, the Father), he certainly confesses along with him God the Word, who is from him and in him and is the Father's own Word, that is, the Son who eternally exists with him, subsists with him outside of time, and is worshipped along with him, and indeed that Moses also confesses the Holy Spirit (although we have already laid out extensive arguments against Julian on this very topic).[31] For it is not in fact true, as Julian claims, that we have "*concocted*" some new innovation and have added our own unexamined ideas to the words that came through the all-wise Moses; rather, we hold the Mosaic writings to be our measuring rod and plumb line.[32]

Moreover, he busies himself[33] with Christ's birth and picks apart the law of the all-wise Moses (for he adamantly maintains – how I do not know – that he does not speak about these topics); therefore, he

[28] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. [29] Deut 6:4. [30] Ps 81(82):6.

[31] Cyril alludes to his forthcoming treatment of this topic in *c. Iul.* 8.18–25, while the parenthetical remark is a reference to his earlier discussion of related material at *c. Iul.* 1.28–34.

[32] Masaracchia treated this sentence and the previous one as *c. Gal.* fr. 63, but the editors of the GCS text state that it seems to them to be a paraphrase of fr. 62 that Cyril has just cited in *c. Iul.* 8.1–2.

[33] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖ; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

ought to learn from us that the aim[34] of Moses' treatise is directed towards the mystery of Christ and that Moses has written about Christ in many places. Aware of this fact, the divine Paul said, "For Christ is the fulfillment of the law" and the prophets.[35] And Christ [539]
himself should suffice on this point, since he cried out to the Jewish crowds, "If you believed Moses, you would believe me. For he wrote about me."[36]

8.7 Come then, although it would be possible to introduce an abundance of true testimonies – and this without any effort – let us pass over all the others and put to the test those passages he has raised, and thus let us show that he is spreading lies on this matter too. The hierophant Moses said to those descended from Israel, "The Lord your God will raise up from among your brothers a prophet like me. You shall listen to him in all matters that you asked from the Lord your God in Choreb on the day of the assembly, when you said, 'We shall not continue to hear the voice of our God and we shall no longer see this great fire, and we shall not die,' and the Lord said to me, 'They are right in all that they have said; I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers and I will place my speech in his mouth and he will speak to them just as I have commanded him. And a person who does not listen [540]
to everything that prophet shall say in my name, I will exact vengeance from him.'"[37]

Observe, therefore, how well the mystery of Christ was signified at just the right time. For the God of the universe came down in the form of fire on Mount Sinai, and "a loud sound of the trumpet rang out," as it is written,[38] but those looking on could not approach the sight and the din of the trumpets was impossible to bear.[39] Hence, having been overcome by an oppressive dread, they cried out, "We shall no longer see this great fire, and we shall no longer hear the voice of the Lord our God."[40] For since they were coming out of the Greeks' stupidity,[41] they thought that the God of the universe is the perceptible fire visible to us and that they were hearing a voice coming from it. But much later and with difficulty

[34] Gk.: σκοπός. [35] Rom 10:4. [36] John 5:46. [37] Deut 18:15–19. [38] Exod 19:16.

[39] Marie-Odile Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.7.4–20 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.4.20–23, 29–43 (Boulnois 2020b, 172–73).

[40] A passage very similar to the previous two sentences appears as a fragment in the catena tradition and was included in Pusey's edition of Cyril's *Commentary on Hebrews*, as is also the case at *c. Iul.* 3.41; 9.17; 10.25. See *Heb.* 12:18 (415.5–9 Pusey). Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 268–9 n. 3.

[41] i.e., Israel had been led astray into errant theology due to their time in Egypt. Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.17; 8.24.

they began to learn that, being slow-minded and dense, they were actually ignorant of the truth, as Christ says to them about God the Father, "You have never heard his voice nor seen his form."[42] **8.8** Therefore, since those at that time who were undergoing an elementary education could not approach the sight of those things molded to convey God's glory, then subsequently the manner of the only-begotten's incarnation needed to be proclaimed in advance.[43] For it was not otherwise possible for him, being God by nature, to live together with those on earth, unless he became a human, appearing in our state while remaining God.[44] For the divine and supreme nature, which surpasses all things, boasts the proper-
[541] ties of eternal steadfastness and immutability.

Furthermore, he was called a prophet, although he was the master of the prophets. For it was necessary, yes necessary indeed, that, having descended into self-emptying[45] and having assumed human finitude, he should not regard human experiences as contemptible.[46] And prophecy is something entirely in keeping with human limitations while also reckoned as one of its highest privileges. Nevertheless, Julian says, "*it clearly does not refer to the one born from Mary. And even if someone were, for your sake, to concede that the passage actually is about him, still Moses says he will be like himself and not like God, a prophet born from humans, just as he was, not from God*."[47] Now as for the fact that the Son is God and from God according to nature, this we will discuss shortly. But since Julian says these words were not written about the one born from Mary, let him

[42] John 5:37. See also Cyril's exegesis of Exod 19:19 at *Ador.* 7 (PG 68.489), and his discussion of this passage along with the above-cited Johannine verse in *Jo.* 5:37–38 (1.381 Pusey). In the former he claimed that the φωνή ("voice" or "sound") that was heard at Sinai was "God's own voice," that is, the divine Son, while in the latter passage he argued that it was in fact not "God's own voice" that the Jewish assembly heard, but merely "a voice, which was constituted miraculously through the sound of more human-like words." Cyril's usage of the Johannine verse here is more in keeping with his exegesis in the Johannine commentary than in *De adoratione*. On these two passages, see Crawford 2014, 117–19; Boulnois 1994, 144–45. Boulnois argued that Cyril's interpretation in the Johannine commentary is shaped by distinctly anti-Eunomian concerns.

[43] This sentence is meant to explain why it was "at just the right time" that the "mystery of Christ" was proclaimed in the passage in Deuteronomy, as Cyril asserts earlier in this paragraph. With Israel having understood in the first half of the passage that they could not endure the divine voice and appearance, it was an opportune occasion to point out that God would instead come to them in a different form, in the form of a human prophet like Moses. For further discussion, see Boulnois, SC 624, 269 n 5.

[44] i.e., the fire on the mountain at Sinai was unapproachable in order to signify that humanity cannot come near to the divine, so the divine must instead come near to humanity through the incarnation of the Word.

[45] Cf. Phil 2:7.

[46] Marie-Odile Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.8.9–11 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.4.43–45 (Boulnois 2020b, 173).

[47] See *c. Gal.* fr. 62.19–22 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.9–12).

point out for us another person who corresponds to Moses, and not just in terms of the features that he might prefer, since he is utterly ignorant of the truth. For Julian imagines that the one foretold will be raised up like Moses solely in the sense that he was a prophet and a human, but he has missed the truth entirely.[48] For one could immediately reply, "But many prophets came after Moses who were human like he was. So then, which one did he have in mind when he spoke these words?" We, therefore, have no choice but to understand the phrase "like me" in terms of multiple features. Come, then, yes come, and let us make every effort to articulate clearly the import of the prophecy about him by comparing Moses' ministry, as far as we can, with the Savior's economy.[49] [542]

8.9 Moses set free those descended from Israel, who were weighed down by an unbearable slavery, and he led them through the midst of the sea while those who formerly ruled over them drowned in it; he nourished them in the wilderness as the manna came down; he commended them to God, became a mediator between God and humans, and was an executant of the law, attuning the people exceedingly well to their various moral duties. One must move on from here, as if from a type and a shadow, to the very beauty of the truth.

In his greed, Satan ruled like a tyrant over us and bound the human race to the yokes of sin. And there was no one in all the world without some experience of his perversity; consequently, he was supercilious, thought highly of himself, and, with no sense of moderation, acted defiantly against everyone's weakness, saying, "With my hand I will take the entire world like a nest and I will seize it like abandoned eggs, and there [543] is no one who will escape me or speak against me."[50] But his blustering in this undertaking was in vain. For he supposed that no one would speak out against his ravaging of the earth and that it would be easy, as it were, to place beneath his own feet the realm lying under heaven. But the wretch was foiled in his hope. For Christ has spoken out and risen up against him; he has rescued us from Satan's snares; he has brought us out from our intellectual slavery and taken those who were stuck in the swamps of sin and placed them out of the reach of the evil one;[51] he has led us across the Jordan; he is the one who comes to destroy the enemies

[48] Marie-Odile Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.8.21–9.5 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.4.46–48 (Boulnois 2020b, 173–74).

[49] Gk.: οἰκονομίᾳ. Cf. Cyril's exegesis of this prophecy in *Jo.* 5:46 (1.391–94 Pusey). Boulnois highlights the fact that Eusebius engaged in a similar discussion in *D.e.* 3.2; see her discussion of the similarities and differences between the two at SC 624, 276 n. 1.

[50] Isa 10:14. [51] Gk.: τοῦ κακοῦ, so possibly just "evil." Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.35.24.

intent on persecuting those determined to live well and who brings to life and saves those subject to God who are eager to set their minds on what pleases him. He has given us, not manna perceptible by the senses, but rather himself as food that is really holy and life-giving and entirely pure. Moreover, through him we have been brought to God the Father, and he has become a mediator between God and humans. In addition to these things, the laws he has ordained no longer consist in types and shadows but are instead the best means of attaining the most excellent life of all.
[544] Hence, while the law indeed has within it the "form of truth,"[52] the truth itself has finally shone forth.

8.10 Consider, moreover, the fact that Moses was not unaware that the only-begotten Word of God would become human and ordain for those on earth laws that were incomparably better than the ancient commandment. For although he wrote the following about those laws decreed through himself, "It is not possible to add to them and it is not possible to take away from them,"[53] nevertheless when Moses considers the preeminence of the only-begotten's lordly honors and the loftiness of his glory and the greatness of his divinely fitting authority, he exhorts the people by saying, "You shall listen to him in all matters that he might speak to you."[54] "For," Moses is saying, "even if it should happen that God himself resolves to issue laws that would actually render otiose the commandment that came through my ministry, we should take no account of this fact; let him legislate with authority, for he is God and master, and it is only reasonable that issuing the required laws is a task appropriate for him and him alone."

Furthermore, lest Moses should appear to be all alone in bringing forward the prophecy about him in this passage, the Father himself has ratified it too. He makes clear that Moses spoke most excellently by
[545] saying, "He is right in all that he has said;[55] I will raise up for them a prophet like you from the midst of his brothers, and I will place my speech in his mouth and he will speak to them everything I have commanded him."[56] What is the point of these words, dear sir? For in

[52] Rom 2:20.

[53] Eccl 3:14. Though Cyril here cites a passage from Ecclesiastes, he perhaps has in mind Moses' words in Deut 4:2, which makes the same point with similar wording.

[54] Cyril's quotation here corresponds to Acts 3:22, in which Peter paraphrases Moses' words in Deut 18:15–19.

[55] Cyril's version has ἐλάλησε ("he said") in keeping with some mss of the LXX, though the majority read ἐλάλησαν ("they said"). Note that he cited this verse in the alternative version with ἐλάλησαν and other minor alterations at *c. Iul.* 8.7.10–15.

[56] Deut 18:17–18.

fact no intelligent person would say God gave his speech[57] to all the holy prophets who brought his words[58] down from above and clearly said, "Thus says the Lord."[59]

8.11 What then might God be intending to indicate about this person when he says, "I will place my speech in his mouth"? In this you should recognize, good sir, our Savior's preeminent status over all. For while the divine prophets, considering their ministry to be precisely that of a servant, used to say, "Thus says the Lord," this person does not do so. Why? Because he himself is the Lord. He, in contrast, used his Father's words for each undertaking, for example in saying to the leper, "I am willing; be cleansed,"[60] and in commanding that those who had died be restored to life; for he says, "Young man, I say to you, rise," and "Lazarus, come forth."[61] Moreover, rebuking the creation and restraining the gusts of the savage wind, he calmed the raging sea by a voice and speech that was especially appropriate for one who is God. For he said, "Silence! Be quiet!"[62] This, I think, is what is meant by "I will place my speech in his mouth." For as the all-wise Paul writes, "He sustains all things by the [546]
speech of his power,"[63] that is, the Father's power. This indeed above all shows plainly that the import of the prediction is directed not at one of the prophets, but clearly at the one who, on the one hand, was, with respect to his nature, ineffably generated as God from God the Father, and who, on the other hand, also did not disdain the fleshly birth from the holy virgin.[64]

8.12 Furthermore, Julian again imposes what is arguably his own idiosyncratic and untested opinion upon the passage "A ruler from Judah will not be wanting nor a leader from his thighs until the one for whom it is reserved comes" – or "what is reserved for him" – "and he will be the expectation of nations";[65] for he claims that these words were written not about Christ, the Savior of us all, "*but about David's kingdom, which in fact*," he says, "*ended with King Zedekiah*."[66] Now, I myself would also say

[57] Gk.: ῥῆμα, which picks up the word used in the biblical text just cited. [58] Gk.: λόγους.

[59] i.e., while all the prophets could attribute their words to God with the phrase "Thus says the Lord," the passage in Deuteronomy indicates that the prophet to come will have God's own "speech," meaning, in Cyril's view, that he will speak and act as though he were God himself. See Boulnois' note on this argument at SC 624, 594.

[60] Matt 8:3. [61] Luke 7:14; John 11:43. [62] Cf. Mark 4:39. [63] Heb 1:3.

[64] *c. Iul.* 8.10–11 was taken over and incorporated in summary fashion in Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 2 Albl (PG 46.204ab). Cf. Boulnois' note in SC 624, 587–94, which helpfully lays out the parallel passages side-by-side allowing easy comparison, along with Riedweg, GCS 20, XII. The author of this work drew extensively from other sections of *c. Iul.* as well. See, e.g., the note at *c. Iul.* 1.26.19–30.

[65] Gen 49:10. [66] *c. Gal.* fr. 62.24–25 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.14–15).

that the prophetic statement made in this passage recalls for us those from the tribe of Judah who ruled over Israel. However, someone should realize from what follows that Julian is lying when he claims David's kingdom "*ended with Zedekiah*."[67] For Saul was the first to have ruled. Then, after a long time had passed, the trappings of rulership arrived at Zedekiah. And when Jerusalem fell and the country of the Jews had been ravaged as a
[547] result of an invasion of the Babylonians, Israel was carried off captive, along with its king, I mean Zedekiah. But once seventy years had passed, God, through Cyrus, freed them from their captivity. When they were brought back to their country and were once again zealous to be instructed in the law that came through Moses, then, yes then, Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel from the tribe of Judah received the scepter among them.

8.13 How, then, can he say that David's kingdom "*ended with Zedekiah*," when, as I said, after the period of captivity, Zerubbabel, who was from the tribe of Judah and David, was established on the royal seat and passed on the scepter through those who succeeded him all the way to the kingdom of Herod whose mother was Jewish, though his father was a foreigner?[68] For, when those from the tribe of Judah who had been allotted to rule came to an end in this way,[69] Christ was born, and he also became the expectation of the nations, since they too have been called through faith. And this was also what was said about them through the voice of Jesus Christ, the Savior of us all: "And I have other sheep, who are not from this fold. I must bring them too, and there will be one flock, one shepherd."[70] Consequently, Jesus Christ our Lord was born, as I said, when the kings from Judah had completely come to an end, and he
[548] became the hope of nations, since this was "reserved for him."[71] For they were called in not through one of the holy prophets, nor indeed through the all-wise Moses, nor through any other person whatsoever; instead, the

[67] The Greek manuscripts have here an additional clause that is identical to a line in the next paragraph at *c. Iul.* 8.13.2–3. Oecolampadius' Latin translation lacks these additional words which were no doubt duplicated in the present paragraph through scribal error. We have therefore followed the GCS editors in deleting the clause.

[68] Cf. Josephus, *AJ* 14.121; *BJ* 1.123; Eusebius, *H.e.* 1.6.2. Cyril's statement is slightly off the mark. He is correct that Herod's father was an Idumean, but his mother was also non-Jewish according to Eusebius, who was explicitly following Josephus on this point.

[69] By "in this way" (οὕτω) Cyril refers to the fact that Herod was a foreigner. That is, since Herod was a foreign ruler, the succession of rulers from Judah had come to an end with his kingdom, implying that the "one for whom it [i.e., the kingdom] is reserved" was about to arrive. This is the same point made by Eusebius in his discussion of this passage at *H.e.* 1.6.1–8. See also Augustine, *C. D.* 18.45.

[70] John 10:16.

[71] Notice that Cyril incorporates the variant reading of Gen 49:10 favored by Julian; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 62.26–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.16–17). Cf. Origen's exegesis of this prophecy at *Cels.* 1.53.

rightful rule, no longer over only Judea but rather over all the nations, was, as I said, "reserved for him." For at one point the prophet Zechariah also said about him, "And there will be one Lord and his name will be one, encompassing the whole earth."[72] And at one point David too sings, "The Lord became king; let the earth rejoice!"[73]

8.14 But our clever debater says once again: "*It is obvious that none of these passages apply to Jesus. For he is not even from Judah – how could he be when according to you he came not from Joseph but from the Holy Spirit?*"[74] It is true that anyone at all who is intelligent will, I think, say that his immaculate body was not from Joseph but was fashioned through the Holy Spirit. But, even so, he was also from the tribe of Judah and from the bloodline of David, since he was, according to the flesh, born from the holy virgin and was publicly registered with Joseph as his father. Moreover, they both belonged to the tribe of Judah, from which Jesse and David came. Julian will, however, probably say, "You could not demonstrate that the virgin who bore him was from the bloodline of David or from the tribe of Judah." In that case, you will have to learn what the sacred writings say about this topic.

The Israelites did not practice the custom of taking a woman from whatever tribe one might choose into one's home for the purpose of marital union; rather, even those who did not want to do so had to take for themselves women from their own tribe. And this custom was strengthened by the divine law. For the following is written in the book [549]
called *Numbers* (this is one of the books of the all-wise Moses): "And Moses commanded the sons of Israel through an ordinance of the Lord, saying, 'This is the word that the Lord instructed for the daughters of Salpaad, saying, "Let them be wives of whomever is pleased with them; except let them be wives from their father's people, and an inheritance for the sons of Israel shall not rotate from tribe to tribe, since the sons of Israel shall stick together, each one in the inheritance of his paternal tribe. And as for every daughter who as next of kin receives an inheritance from the tribes of the sons of Israel, let them be wives for one who is from her father's people, in order that the sons of Israel, each of them, might be entitled as next of kin to his paternal inheritance."'"[75] Surely

[72] Zech 14:9–10. On Cyril's unusual form of this passage, see the note at *c. Iul.* 3.53.

[73] Ps 96(97):1. [74] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 62.27–29 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.18–20).

[75] Num 36:5–8. Cyril appears to be the first Greek-speaking Christian author to cite this passage from the Pentateuch, though it is probably the passage Eusebius had in mind when he alluded to an unspecified Mosaic law that forbade intermarriage between tribes to avoid problems of inheritance. As Cyril does here, Eusebius had appealed to this principle to prove Mary's Davidic descent. Cf. Eusebius, *H.e.* 1.7.17; *Qu. Steph.* 1.10.

you think it a good idea now to concede, even on the basis of this very law, that they both – Joseph and the virgin – were from one tribe, the tribe of Judah, I mean, and of David? Julian, however, says Joseph was "*not from Judah*" and "*sets aside*"[76] the examination [of this claim]. Accordingly, I will discuss these issues with him too at the proper time.[77]

8.15 Julian nevertheless pursues his argument to such a degree of insolence that he even dares to overthrow, as much as he possibly can, the manner of the only-begotten's incarnation and even the existence of the Word himself.[78] For he says the hierophant Moses, along with the holy
[550] prophets who came after him, recognized only one God, the Father, and numbered with him absolutely no one else. And he writes as follows:

Julian

Nevertheless, since I am going to examine closely the truth of this matter in my second book, I am setting it aside.[79] *But for now let it also be granted that he is "a ruler from Judah,"*[80] *not "God from God,"*[81] *as the saying among you goes, nor is it the case that "all things came to be through him and without him not one thing came to be."*[82] *Rather, it was also said in the book of Numbers, "A star from Jacob will arise and a man from Israel."*[83] *It is surely obvious that this applies to David and to those who came from him. For David was the child of Jesse.*[84]

If, therefore, you are going to try to infer something from these writings, point out just one supporting passage, drawing it from the same source from

[76] Cyril alludes to the opening line of the fragment he is about to cite: *c. Gal.* fr. 64.5–7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9–10).

[77] Cyril's further discussion of this topic has not been preserved. Presumably it occurred in his treatment of the gospels' infancy accounts, which seems to have been located in book 11, based on the surviving fragments.

[78] Cyril signals the two topics that will occupy him for the remainder of book 8: the existence of the Word of God (*c. Iul.* 8.18–33) and the Word's incarnation (*c. Iul.* 8.34–51). On the structure of the book, cf. Boulnois 2020b, 183–91.

[79] This is the only time in the surviving fragments that Julian explicitly mentions a second book of *Against the Galileans*; cf. Riedweg, GCS 20, XCI–XCII. If we assume this fragment immediately followed fr. 62 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.1–2), then "this matter" (περὶ τούτου) refers to the discrepancy between the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, suggesting that Julian's mostly lost second book was devoted to problematic passages from the New Testament. In fact, a portion of Julian's criticism of Jesus' genealogies in book two of *c. Gal.* has been preserved by later Syriac authors. See *c. Iul.* fr. 75.

[80] Gen 49:10.

[81] Julian here alludes to the Nicene Creed, as he does again in the next fragment (*c. Gal.* fr. 65.1 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 8.34.14–15]).

[82] John 1:3. Although Julian cites the Gospel of John, he may still have in mind the Nicene Creed, since it contains an allusion to this passage shortly after the phrase "God from God."

[83] Num 24:17.

[84] On the obscure logical relation of the two preceding sentences, see Boulnois' comment in SC 624, 292–3 n. 3.

which I have drawn so many. But Moses says in Deuteronomy that he acknowledged one God, the God of Israel: "So that you know that the Lord your God, he is one, and there is no other besides him."[85] *Additionally he also says, "And you shall bear in your mind that the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above and on the earth below, and there is no other besides him."*[86] *And again: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one."*[87] *And again: "See that I am he, and there is no God besides me."*[88] *So, then, these are the words of Moses, who maintained that there is only one God.* [551]

8.16 *Nevertheless, perhaps these people*[89] *will reply, "But we do not say that there are two or three gods." I will prove that they do say this as well,*[90] *introducing as a witness John who says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."*[91] *You see that he is said to be "with God"; whether this is the one born from Mary or someone else – so that I may answer Photinus*[92] *too at the same time – makes no difference at present. I leave that fight to you. Indeed, the fact that he says "with God" and "in the beginning" is sufficient evidence. How, then, do these words agree with those of Moses? Nevertheless, he says,*[93] *it does agree with the words of Isaiah. For Isaiah*

[85] Deut 4:35. [86] Deut 4:39. [87] Deut 6:4. [88] Deut 32:39. [89] i.e., the Galileans.

[90] It is possible that Porphyry also highlighted the inconsistency of Christians believing in a Trinity and yet denouncing Greek polytheism. Cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* fr. 80T Becker and Boulnois' note in SC 624, 294 n. 2.

[91] John 1:1.

[92] Photinus was bishop of Sirmium in the mid fourth century and is frequently paired in historical sources with his mentor, Marcellus of Ancyra; together they propagated a Monarchian Christology that viewed the Word as merely the impersonal extension of the Father's activity which only became "Son" through the incarnation in the man Jesus. Hence the distinction between the "Word" and the "one born from Mary" in the above passage. Photinus developed a limited but persistent following across the Mediterranean, despite being condemned by a number of councils, most notably in 351 by a council in Sirmium convened by Emperor Constantius, Julian's predecessor and preeminent political opponent. Julian's *Ep*. 90 Bidez (= *Ep*. 55 Wright) is addressed to Photinus, though it is merely a fragment of a letter that survives because it was quoted in Latin in Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 4.2.61–64. The letter is, nevertheless, historically significant, since it contains the sole reference in the entirety of Julian's extant corpus to his intention of writing *Against the Galileans*. Moreover, the themes of the letter overlap with the present fragment, since Julian praises Photinus for taking the view that "he whom one holds to be a god can by no means be brought into the womb." Julian's esteem for Photinus is perhaps also reflected in the comment by Ambrosiaster that "the worldly" considered the bishop to be wise because he refused to regard Christ as God on the grounds that he was born (*In 1 Cor*. 4:10). Julian makes another possible reference to Photinus' Christology at *c. Gal.* fr. 80.4–6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.8.7–9), and it may be that his mention of "the present" in the sentence above is an allusion to that forthcoming discussion (cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 295 n. 6). On Photinus, see Hanson 1988, 235–38; Bouffartigue 1992, 117–19; Ayres 2004, 134–35; Elm 2012, 233–35; Ritter 2020, 31–32. On Photinus' exegesis of the Johannine prologue, traces of which are preserved in Ambrosiaster, *Quaest.* 91.11 and involve creative repunctuation of the biblical text, see Speller 1983, 111–12.

[93] Neumann emended φησίν ("he/it says") to φασίν ("they say") in keeping with the plural οὗτοι at the beginning of this paragraph. If one follows the mss and reads the singular verb, as the GCS edition does, the implied subject is ambiguous. It could be, as Boulnois suggests, Julian's imagined response from a Christian interlocutor (SC 624, 296 n. 1). Cf. the note at *c. Iul.* 10.22.

says, "Behold, the virgin will conceive and will bear a son."[94] *Let it be granted that this too is said about Jesus,*[95] *even though it by no means was. For a married woman who had lain with her husband was not a virgin even before*
[552] *she had conceived. But let it be granted that this was said about him. Isaiah doesn't actually say, does he, that God will be born from the virgin – since you do not cease calling Mary "God-bearer"?*[96] *Nor does he actually say, does he, that the one born from the virgin will be the only-begotten Son of God and "firstborn of all creation"?*[97] *But as for what was said by John – "All things came to be through him and without him not one thing came to be" – is anyone able to prove that this is in the prophetic utterances? But listen to the series of passages we are highlighting from those same books: "Lord, our God, take possession of us. We know no other besides you."*[98] *And the king Hezekiah too has been portrayed by them as praying, "Lord, God of Israel who sits upon the cherubim, you alone are God."*[99] *He doesn't leave any room for a second God, does he?*[100]

Cyril

Now as for the passage that says "a ruler from Judah will not be wanting nor a leader from his thighs until the one for whom it is reserved comes,"[101] I have, I believe, already said enough about the fact that it must be regarded as suitable and appropriate especially for Christ. **8.17** But, since Julian touches upon another prophecy as well – I mean the one that was delivered through Balaam, who said, "A star will arise from
[553] Jacob and a man from Israel and he will shatter the rulers of Moab and

[94] Isa 7:14.

[95] The manuscripts here read "God" (θεοῦ) but Masaracchia and the GCS text follow the suggestion of Gollwitzer that the correct reading should be "Jesus" (Ἰησοῦ); see now Boulnois, SC 624, 296–97 n. 3 for justification of this emendation.

[96] Gk.: θεοτόκον. The word will be used again at *c. Gal.* fr. 65.2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.34.15), on which see Boulnois' note in SC 624, 595–97. This word would become the flashpoint of the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius from 428 onwards. The fact that Cyril here passes over it in silence probably indicates that he composed *c. Iul.* prior to the outbreak of that conflict (cf. Boulnois 2020b, 168–70, and "The Dating of *Against Julian*" in our Introduction). On the usage of the term in the fourth century, see Sferlea 2016. It is difficult to determine the intended referent of Julian's passing remark that Christians regularly used the term. Although he did not coin the word, it was first put to theological use by Apollinaris of Laodicea, who was active during Julian's brief reign. For fourth-century occurrences of the term, see Marcellus, *Inc. et c. Ar.* 8; 22 (PG 26.996a; 1025a); Eusebius, *Marcell.* 2.1.4; *V.C.* 3.43.2; *Qu. Marin.* 2.6 [5]; *Qu. Steph. suppl.* 13 (PG 22.927d); Athanasius, *V. Anton.* 36.4; *Ar.* 3.14.2; 3.29.1; 3.33.2; 3.33.4; Apollinaris, *Fid. Inc.* 4–6; *Ep. Jov.* 1; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 10.19; Basil, *In sanctam Christi generationem* 5 (PG 31.1468b); Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 101.16; *Or.* 4.14; Gregory of Nyssa, *Ep.* 3.24; *Virg.* 14.1; 19.1; *Nativ.* 1136 Mann; Epiphanius, *Anc.* 30.4; 75.6.

[97] Cf. John 1:18; Col 1:15. [98] Isa 26:13. [99] Isa 37:16.

[100] *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas.; Wright 1923, 396–401. On this fragment, cf. Boulnois 2020c, 201–04.

[101] Gen 49:10.

he will plunder the sons of Seth. And Edom will be his inheritance"[102] – and indeed since Julian says such words must also be connected to David or to those who ruled over Israel at various times, he should realize that once again he is attempting to uncouple something that seems right to everyone and is viewed as correct by people who are not ignorant of the God-breathed scripture. For those who were kings over Israel did not rule over the so-called nations, but rather were continuously being attacked and attacking, and were a band of irreconcilable brothers at odds with one another on every occasion. And we could look at this in another way as well: if, as he says, the import of the prophecy calls to mind David or the other kings, shouldn't he have instead said, "*stars* shall arise from Jacob and *leaders* from Israel"? Yet the prophecy has in view one person who has been singled out, who is, as it were, preeminent among the stars, and clearly this is Christ, who arose from Jacob or from Israel according to the flesh.[103]

To produce a great many more arguments in addition to these would not be difficult, but for now I will refrain from doing so and will reserve the fuller account for the appropriate occasion.[104] But since, as I said previously, he dares to overthrow entirely the Son's ineffable birth from God the Father and indeed also says that the Son neither exists at all nor is he God, and since, in addition to this, he derides the manner of the incarnation as well, it seems that I have no choice but to muster the doctrines of piety and wrestle vigorously with his argument on both [554] fronts. So then, to begin with, the former topic should be subjected to examination. For I think it is necessary first to prove clearly that the Word is God and is from God. Then, next in turn, it remains to establish from the holy and God-breathed scripture that the Word became human, without trading away the existence that he had (for he is unchangeable and immutable in terms of his nature), but by assuming a likeness to us by the addition of flesh and blood.[105]

8.18 So then, Julian has selectively gathered together into a heap a great many passages that make mention of the one and only God, both from

[102] Num 24:17.

[103] Cf. Gal 3:16, where Paul argued that the promise given to Abraham was made not to his "seeds" but rather to his "seed" in the singular; for the reference to Christ's lineage "according to the flesh," see Rom 1:3; 9:5.

[104] Cyril is probably alluding to his presentation of a series of prophecies about the incarnation in *c. Iul.* 8.40–43, though he could be referring to a later section that appeared in some portion of the lost second decade of books, perhaps the discussion of the infancy accounts in book 11, as suggested by Boulnois 2020b, 188.

[105] This second topic will be taken up in *c. Iul.* 8.34–51.

Moses' book and from the prophetic proclamations, and has mixed them up with his own words. Moreover, he similarly thinks we are opposing the views of the holy men and are confessing there to be three gods, if we think rightly and determine that God the only-begotten Word, who is from God the Father and in him and belongs to him, has always coexisted with him, and so too has the Spirit that is consubstantial with him. For in fact the one nature of the divinity is understood in three *hypostases* – in the
[555] Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. Yet in no way is it chopped up by us into an alterity of natures, nor do those three who are named lapse into a state of alienation from one another in terms of their essence.[106] Rather, one and the same principle[107] proceeds through the entire holy Trinity, gathering them together into one nature of divinity, even if we understand that each of them subsists distinctly;[108] consequently, even if someone should say there is one God, such a person could nonetheless never form a notion of the Father apart from his own offspring nor apart from the Spirit who is naturally poured forth from him, which is also his own Spirit. For just as when someone talks about a human, he will certainly in every case also recall those properties that essentially[109] inhere within him (properties which, if naturally present, cause him to be a human, but no longer do so if they are not present in him), in the exact same way, so it seems to me, the meaning of other words also associates with the corresponding reality an unavoidable mental image.

Therefore, someone who says God is a Father indicates along with him also his own Son who is from him and in him according to nature. For if it is accurate to say that he did not become a Father at some point in time (for he has no contingent attributes at all, but is perfect in himself), then one absolutely must conclude that what[110] is proper to him, that to which he is a Father, coexists with him.[111] And if indeed he is always Craftsman and did not acquire this role at some point in time, then there certainly exists along with him the one through whom he fashioned
[556] everything, the one who is the "radiance of his glory and the imprint of his *hypostasis*."[112] For so he has been called in the statement of those who

[106] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς. [107] Gr.: λόγος.

[108] *c. Iul.* 8.18.8–14 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 864. The final phrase translates ἰδιοσυστάτως, a term that is very rare if not nonexistent before Cyril; cf. Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 1.6 (PG 46.197b); Didymus (?), *Trin.* 3.41.1 (PG 39.984b); Boulnois, SC 624, 82–85.

[109] Gk.: οὐσιωδῶς. [110] Cyril here uses the neuter τὸ ἴδιον.

[111] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.18.25–28 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.29–31 (2020b, 174–75). See also her note on this passage, including the suggestion of a conjectural emendation, in SC 624, 597–98.

[112] Heb 1:3.

have spoken of God. Is light, then, ever perceived apart from its radiance? And when did the imprint of the Father's *hypostasis* not exist?

8.19 Therefore, though we ourselves also confess that there exists one Craftsman and Lord of the universe, we acknowledge God the Word, who coexists with him as his own and who, in terms of his nature, was ineffably begotten from him, blazing forth like light from light or like a word from intellect to intellect. For his birth is exceedingly subtle, appropriate to the divine, and transcends all corporeal imagery.[113] Therefore, the person who denies the Son is depriving the light of its radiance and is determining that intellect does not possess a word.[114]

Though adducing such comparative examples is very slight, it nevertheless suffices to draw our intellect to those realities that are beyond reason.[115] For if something is brought into existence, it is situated below the glory of the substance above all substances, and there is nothing that corresponds exactly to that essence and is invariably like it. We, therefore, quite reasonably collect what we need from these examples, assembling barely a single paltry idea from this multitude to give a vague and modest representation of the realities under investigation. And the all-wise Paul, for example, says, "We see now in a mirror and in a riddle."[116] Moreover, the Son himself provides us with further confirmation of the fact that we are entirely unable to apprehend the Father without the Son. For he says, "The one who denies the Son does not have the Father either."[117] In addition, he says to the [557] crowds of the Jews, "You know neither me nor my Father. If you knew me, you would know my Father also."[118] For the term "Father" would truly make no sense unless he has the Son as the offspring of his own nature. For in keeping with the meaning of relational terms, just as there would never be a son unless, of course, there is always understood to be a father, so in exactly the same way one could never imagine a father if there was no son.[119]

[113] While the notion of transcending corporeal imagery occurs in some earlier Christian authors (and elsewhere in Cyril's corpus), he may have drawn the phrasing from Athanasius, *Gent.* 2.20; see also *c. Iul.* 5.30.1–18; 8.25.6–7; 8.49.4–5.

[114] Gk.: λόγον. [115] Gk.: λόγου. [116] 1 Cor 13:12.

[117] 1 John 2:23 (this statement is thus not made by Christ, although it does sound like something he might have said in the fourth gospel).

[118] John 8:19.

[119] Cyril is here using the language of logic and a common example that occurs in philosophical sources. The phrase "the meaning of relational terms" translates τὴν τῶν πρός τι λεγομένων δύναμιν, and πρός τι (literally, what is "in relation to something" or "relative to something") was one of Aristotle's ten categories (*Cat.* 6a36–8b24). See especially Aristotle, *Cat.* 6b28, where the Stagirite points out that "all relatives are spoken in relation to their correlatives" (Πάντα δὲ τὰ πρός τι πρός ἀντιστρέφοντα λέγεται). For the precise application of this principle (and its corollary principle of the simultaneity in most cases of relatives and correlatives at 7b15) to the father–son relation, see Porphyry, *in Cat.* 118.8–13. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 87–91.

8.20 So, to reiterate, the divine and ineffable birth of the Word is lifted up on high beyond the limits of the creation. For there was never a time at which point we could conceive of him as not existing;[120] rather he is the maker of the ages and possesses an existence that dwells beyond all time. For example, he said to Moses, "I am the one who exists. […] This is my name."[121] Hence, the existing Word that subsists together with the existing Father is reasonably understood to be from him, in him, and consubstantial with him. For the offspring of the substance of one who exists could not possibly be something that did not exist. And
[558] indeed, given that created beings – all those endowed with the power of being able to give birth – customarily give birth not to things that differ in essence, but rather to things that are like themselves in terms of each and every one of those properties essentially rooted in their nature, would it not then be utterly absurd for the Craftsman to be inferior to his own creations in this respect? Thus, the Father has begotten the Son from himself, who is also his own Word, Wisdom, and Power.[122] Through him he fashions all things and brings them into existence, and similarly he makes wise what is receptive to wisdom and empowers what is in need of power. For the Father's character is rendered completely lucid and transparent in the Son. And just as he depicts in his own nature the one who bore him, so also he himself exists in the Father and is one with him by an identity of nature, differing only in the fact that he is the Son. Thus, the existing one is from an existing one and this is the name most in keeping with his nature. For example, in the following passage the divine David shows clearly that the Son is invariably in the same state: "The heavens will be destroyed, but you will remain; they will all wear out like a garment; like a cloak you will roll them up and they will be changed, but you are the same, and your years will not fail."[123]

8.21 And actually you should not be surprised to find that the Spirit-bearers have cried out with such words about him. For these ideas also seemed right to the elite ranks of the Greeks. Plutarch, for example, in

[120] As noted by Boulnois, (SC 624, 308 n. 3), the phrasing here echoes Arius' infamous claim that "there was a time when [the Son] did not exist." The suggestion that Julian and his Neoplatonic allies held to a theology that amounted to Arianism will be developed below at *c. Iul.* 8.26. Cf. Boulnois 1997.

[121] Exod 3:14–15. Cyril has omitted several lines of text between the two clauses of this citation, marked by ellipses. He cites the same version of the passage, also omitting intervening material, on three other occasions: *Dial. Trin.* 5.559.1–2; 5.565.36–38; *Ador.* 2 (PG 68.252a).

[122] Cf. 1 Cor 1:24. [123] Ps 101(102):27–28.

his own book says that, when speaking to the divine, people must address it as "E"[124] and "One." And he adds these words:

> Therefore, it seems to me that the letter signifies neither number nor order nor conjunction nor any of the subordinate parts of speech.[125] But it is an address and invocation of God that is complete in itself and makes the one who utters the word mindful of God's power.[126] [559]

And after some other material he once more says,

> But God exists – if[127] one even needs to say so – and he exists without reference to time, but in terms of eternity, which is motionless, timeless, and unceasing, and in which there is neither before nor after, neither future nor past, neither older nor younger. Rather, existing as one in a single "now," he has also filled eternity, and he alone is that which truly exists in an identical manner, since it has neither come into existence nor is it about to come into existence, having neither beginning nor end. Therefore, those who wish to address it must do so accordingly, with the words "You are" and […][128] as some of the ancients did, "You are one." For the divine is not many things, as each of us consists of hundreds of different components […], but that which exists must exist as one.[129]

Hence, the nature of the divinity is one, and the attribute of existence would be especially appropriate for it. And, for example, in the *Timaeus* Plato says,

[124] The word εἶ, which is used here and in the title to Plutarch's treatise, both denotes the letter we call epsilon (ε) and also serves as the second-person singular present active indicative form of the verb εἰμί ("you are"). Note that Cyril has anticipated this passage from Plutarch by citing Ps 101(102):27–28 at the conclusion of the last section which contains the same verbal form.

[125] The possibilities listed here were all canvassed in earlier sections of Plutarch's dialogue: the use of εἶ to signify epsilon, the sign used for the numeral 5; its use as "if" in hypothetical syllogisms (i.e., its order in the propositional framing of a syllogism) or as a simple conditional conjunction; and its use as an adverbial particle or single syllable within a larger unit.

[126] Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 391f–392a. Cyril has taken this citation and the next one from the much longer extract from Plutarch cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.11, specifically 11.11.1 and 11.11.14–15. The portions quoted by Cyril are the beginning and the conclusion of the passage Eusebius had cited. Like Cyril, Eusebius had preceded his quotation of Plutarch with quotations of Exod 3:14 and Ps 101(102):28 (both quoted in *c. Iul.* 8.20 above, but in each instance with an additional verse lacking in Eusebius). See Boulnois SC 624, 150–51.

[127] The GCS text here reads εἶ ("you are"), while the mss of Eusebius and Cyril universally have εἰ ("if"). The reading εἶ is a conjectural emendation by the Plutarchan editor Patzig. We depart from it and follow the mss, as does Boulnois.

[128] Cyril has conveniently omitted Plutarch's interjection "by Zeus" at this point, even though his Christian source for this quotation, Eusebius, had kept it.

[129] Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 393a7–393b7. As noted by the ellipses in brackets, Cyril has omitted the phrase found in both Plutarch and Eusebius "which arise in the course of our experience, a heterogeneous and pompous collection mixed together" (ἐν πάθεσι γινομένων ἄθροισμα παντοδαπὸν καὶ πανηγυρικὸν μεμιγμένον). He has also slightly abbreviated the final part of the passage he quotes (εἶναι δεῖ τὸ ὂν ὥσπερ ἕν), which reads in its full version "being must be one, just as one must be being" (ἓν εἶναι δεῖ τὸ ὄν, ὥσπερ ὂν τὸ ἕν).

[560] "Are we then correct in having said previously that heaven is one, or is it more correct to speak of many and infinite heavens? It must be termed one, if indeed it is to be created after its pattern. For that which contains all intelligible living creatures could never be second along with another."[130] And there is a single account that knows a single God.[131]

Therefore, God is one, as I said, and does not exist in all things but is understood to be, and in fact is, other than everything and possesses a supreme nature. For if he contains all things, how could he himself not be outside of all things?

8.22 Our opponent, however, will perhaps eagerly clap his hands together at this very point and indeed also say, "You, sir, have made my argument for me. For I said that Moses, the instructor from whom you receive your doctrines, whom you so admire, mentions only one God. For he said, 'Before me there was no other God and after me there will not be another.'[132] And once more, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one,'[133] along with other passages similar to these." So then, we ask, who, good sir, do you think and say is being indicated by these statements for believers in the holy and consubstantial Trinity? Undoubtedly, he will say "the Father." For he does away with the Son's existence once and for all and the aim[134] of his argument is intensely
[561] focused on this very goal.

So then, Moses spoke about God by the Holy Spirit, as did also the holy prophets who came after him. Moreover, the statements of the saints must never be false in any way. In light of this, although Moses wrote as

[130] Plato, *Ti.* 31a. Eusebius had cited this passage in *P.e.* 11.13.2, almost immediately after the passage from Plutarch Cyril has just quoted. Most likely, therefore, Cyril drew this passage also from Eusebius. The passage was also cited by Clement, *Str.* 5.79.4 and Theodoret, *Affect.* 4.49.

[131] This sentence presents two interrelated problems: 1) Cyril's intent in quoting it; and 2) textual variation in the manuscript tradition. First, as printed in the GCS edition, the sentence is identical to Eusebius' own commentary on this *Timaeus* passage at *P.e.* 11.13.3 and would be translated "And it is clear that he knows one God" or "And it is clear that he knows God is one." Since the next sentence commences with the sort of transitional phrase Cyril typically uses following a quotation from a source, it seems most likely that he took this sentence to be a continuation of the *Timaeus* passage, not realizing it was Eusebius' commentary. We have therefore indented it along with the Plato passage (indicating Cyril's likely understanding of what he was quoting), but marked the text of the *Timaeus* with quotation marks. See *c. Iul.* 5.38.15–20, where he made a similar mistake when taking a passage of Plato from Clement of Alexandria. This raises the second issue. The manuscript tradition of Eusebius has δῆλος δε ἐστιν ἕνα θεὸν εἰδώς, while the manuscripts of *c. Iul.* have λόγος δε ἐστιν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν εἰδώς. The GCS editors have emended the text in light of the Eusebian textual tradition (i.e., changing λόγος to δῆλος and removing εἰς), though in doing so it becomes difficult to make sense of the sentence if Cyril thought he was still quoting Plato. We have therefore chosen to follow Boulnois' simpler emendation of changing the word εἰς to εἷς. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 151–53.

[132] Isa 43:10. [133] Deut 6:4. [134] Gk.: σκοπός.

follows – "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one" – and added other statements similar to this, another one of the holy prophets said the following about Christ, the Savior of us all, "This is our God; no other will be reckoned along with him. He procured every path of knowledge and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel, his beloved. And after these things he appeared on earth and lived together with humans."[135] Did not the Son who became human live together with those on earth, and yet procure for the ancients every path of knowledge? For he it was who legislated the law that came through Moses. If so, then how could this be open to dispute? But since, as the prophet says, "This is our God" and "no other will be reckoned along with him," what are we to do, good sir? Should we deny the Father in light of the fact that the Son too is the only God? Or should we refuse to accept the Son, on grounds that the Father is the one and only God? If we were to take either option, where then would the faith of those who have been called end up? It is for this reason that one nature of the divinity is worshipped [562] in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

8.23 Furthermore, since he said it is from Moses that we are obliged to provide at a bare minimum a "*single* passage" on this topic[136] (for he probably imagines that we would have none at our disposal), let him have many such passages, even those that he himself, I suspect, admires on the assumption that they clash with the Son's existence, though we will discover that in fact they agree perfectly well with what I was just now saying. Observe, then, yes, observe the hierophant Moses indicating for us the fullness of the holy Trinity in many passages. For he has introduced the God of the universe as saying, "Let us make humankind according to our image and according to our likeness."[137] Therefore, the phrase "Let us make" offers an intimation of the coexistent Son and Holy Spirit, and in the declaration "according to our image" one quite rightly sees the indistinguishability of their natural identity. For if there is only one underlying substrate, how could it receive the image of beings with different natures?[138] Nor was God speaking to angels or rational powers

[135] Bar 3:36–38.

[136] Cyril is referring to *c. Gal.* fr. 62.17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.6–7). His point is that the passage from Baruch discussed in the previous paragraph of course does not come from Moses' books, so he will next fulfill Julian's demand by demonstrating the doctrine of the Trinity using the writings of Moses.

[137] Gen 1:26.

[138] The "underlying substrate" (τὸ ὑποκείμενον) is the "human" (ἄνθρωπος) of Gen 1:26, with Cyril's point being that a single human could take on the likeness of only a single paradigmatic form, namely the one divine nature. His argument is the inverse of Plato's argument at *Ti.* 31ab

when he said, "Let us make humanity according to our image," if indeed it is the case that no created being is essentially and indistinguishably identical [to him].[139] Otherwise, there would arguably be nothing to
[563] prevent someone from recklessly claiming that God and creation are in no sense severed apart into a difference of natures.

And indeed, when the tower was being built by those who at that time had profane intentions, Moses again claimed the God of the universe said, "Come, let *us* go down and confuse their tongues there."[140] Moreover, recalling the sin of the Sodomites, he once more said, "And *the Lord* rained down fire and brimstone *from the Lord* upon Sodom."[141] And Moses also says that when Abraham was sitting at the Oak of Mamre three men were seen by him, who figuratively represent[142] the holy and consubstantial Trinity, and then the divine Abraham did not address them as "Lords" but instead, using the singular, he said, "Lord, if I have found favor in your eyes."[143] Now we also included these passages in another book,[144] but necessity required that we mention them cursorily at this point as well.

8.24 Furthermore, I think it is also necessary to clarify the murkiness of Julian's internal reasoning using those very passages he has adduced. So then, since Israel had only just been led out from the Egyptian error (for
[564] in Egypt they had worshipped the falsely named gods that Julian designates "*ethnarchs*" and "*city-guardians*,"[145] God lifts them up to a knowledge of the truth and makes his identity clear to them, saying, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one,"[146] and once more, "So that you may know that I am God and there is no one besides me,"[147] and again, "There shall be no other gods for you but me."[148] We hold that these words were wisely said for the destruction of the Greek delusion. For by naming himself "one God" on every occasion, he does not permit them to imagine that there are many gods.

Nevertheless, even if he says he is one, he does not thereby preclude the Son from being God and being called so. For, as I said, the Son is in him and from him according to nature, as his own Word, Wisdom, and

that there can only be one heaven because it must resemble the "pattern" (παράδειγμα) after which it was made, namely the one "all perfect living creature." That is, while Cyril argues from the singularity of the human who resembles the divine to the singularity of the divine nature, Plato argues from the singularity of the higher realm to the singularity of the heaven made to resemble it.

[139] Cyril has already considered this notion at *c. Iul.* 1.30–33. [140] Gen 11:7. [141] Gen 19:24.
[142] Gk.: ἐπέχοντας τύπον. [143] Gen 18:3. [144] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.24–34.
[145] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 26.3; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12; 4.40.4; 4.46.7–8). [146] Deut 6:4.
[147] Cyril's citation is a conflation of Deut 4:35 and Isa 46:9. [148] Exod 20:3.

Power, the one through whom and in whom he exercises authority over the universe. For you have discovered that Moses says on every occasion, "The Lord your God, the Lord is one,"[149] and again, "So that you may know that the Lord your God, he is God in heaven and on earth."[150] But Paul, who was learned in the law and a priest of the divine mysteries at one point also wrote to us, "For there is for us one God, the Father, from whom are all things and from whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist."[151] You should, therefore, recognize that though he names the Father "one God," [565] still he calls the Son the "one Lord." Yet even though the Son is one Lord, the Father, as God, is also understood to be the Lord. And indeed, though the Father is called the "one God," the Son is God insofar as he too is Lord by nature. For the property of being divine by nature undoubtedly entails the property of being Lord, and the property of truly being Lord entails the glory of being divine.

8.25 Therefore, no one could doubt that the Word "existed in the beginning" and that the Word both "was God" and "was with God."[152] Now the phrase "he existed in the beginning" would indicate to us the quality of timelessness. For as I said, if the Father always exists as a Father (for he did not come to be [a Father] in time), then the unavoidable conclusion is that the one who is by nature in him and from him coexists with him. Furthermore, the phrase "with God" must not be understood in a spatial sense, since the divine is beyond all corporeal imagery,[153] but should instead be understood as "together with God," meaning that he is in the nature of the divinity. For the one who has ineffably been begotten from God according to nature must himself be God.

Moreover, Plato himself would also leap upon this man who disbelieves the words of the saints, since he has written as follows about the Greeks' gods:

> As for the other daemons, to know or to talk about their origin is too great a task for us, and we must believe those who have previously discussed it, [566] indeed those who claimed to be descendants of gods; let us believe[154] them

[149] Deut 6:4.

[150] Cyril's citation seems to be a paraphrase of Deut 4:35, which does not include the phrase "in heaven and on earth," though similar phrasing does appear in Deut 4:39, cited by Julian above in *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.21–23).

[151] 1 Cor 8:6. [152] John 1:1–2.

[153] For the notion of transcending corporeal imagery, see *c. Iul.* 8.19.6 (with note) and 8.49.4–5.

[154] Cyril's version of this passage reads πιστεύσωμεν ὡς ("let us believe [them] on the grounds that") while the received Platonic text has σαφῶς δε που ("and clearly no doubt"). When Cyril quotes the passage again at *c. Iul.* 8.45, he omits the extra verb. For discussion see Boulnois, SC 624, 153.

> on the grounds that they know their own progenitors. It is, therefore, impossible to disbelieve children of gods, although they speak without plausible or compelling proofs; and inasmuch as they claimed to be reporting family affairs, let us follow custom and believe them.[155]

He does not permit us, human as we are, to subject to examination topics that surpass intellect and reason, but said one must ascribe to them an unquestioning[156] faith, despite the fact that their detailed accounts of such matters lack "plausible or compelling proofs."[157] But if Plato does not permit us to rebuke those who represent the polytheistic error, those who speak "from their heart and not from the mouth of the Lord,"[158] as it is written, but rather have been brought to do so by a diabolical spirit, and if Plato says unbelief does not go unpunished, then to rise up against the statements of the saints and to say that they are poorly made and to declare the words of the Holy Spirit a lie – what sort of extreme madness would this be?! For the Spirit-bearers would be venerable and trustworthy sons of the truth, as their inherent good life and performance of divine signs have testified.

8.26 The Word, therefore, was God and indeed, as I said, was also with God, that is, he was subsistent, alive, and powerful and, even if he is a
[567] Son, he is not other than the Father – I mean in terms of his existence as God. He is living and life-giving, and through him everything has been brought into existence. Moreover, we hold that he is invisible, impalpable, incorruptible, unchangeable, perfect in himself, pure in perfection, beyond all intellect and reason.

Furthermore, we are also aware that those persons who are especially supercilious and take arrogant pride in their worldly wisdom, though they have busied themselves[159] with subtle investigations, have not done so in an entirely blameless manner. For the light of the truth has not flashed upon them. For Christ at one point said, "No one knows who the Son is except the Father, nor does anyone know <who> the Father <is> except the Son and the one to whom the Son reveals him."[160] In what way, then, could they possibly understand such subtle and ineffable realities belonging to the realm of contemplation when the Son has not revealed it to them?

[155] Plato, *Ti.* 40de. Julian himself had alluded to this passage at *c. Her.* 24.237b. It was also cited by Athenagoras, *Leg.* 23.5; Clement, *Str.* 5.13.84.1; Eusebius, *P.e.* 2.7.1; 13.1.1; 13.14.5; *Theoph.* 2.31 (93.23–94.8 Gressmann/Laminski); Theodoret, *Affect.* 1.59; 3.34; John Philoponus, *De aet.* 18.8, 633–34. Cyril will quote it again at *c. Iul.* 8.45. For a discussion of Cyril's distinctiveness from these other Christian citations of the passage, see Boulnois, SC 624, 153–57.

[156] Gk.: ἀπολυπραγμόνητον. [157] Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.38.23–28; 10.41.6–9; fr. 59. [158] Jer 23:16.

[159] Gk.: πολυπραγμονήσαντας; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[160] Luke 10:22.

Nonetheless, even these people themselves also agree with the views of the Christians, since they set forth three primary *hypostases*,[161] insist that the substance of God reaches as far as three *hypostases*, and sometimes even use the word "Trinity."[162] They would have had everything needed for the correct view had they been willing to apply the principle of consubstantiality to the three *hypostases*, in order that the nature of the divinity also be understood as one, not having a tripartite division into different natures and the inevitable appearance of the *hypostases* being inferior to one other. For they situate the first cause as standing in the highest place, unmoved and entirely inert. Moreover, they say that this is the Good from which comes Intellect, which is perfected by contemplating the Good and is even named by them the second god and the "*proximate Craftsman*" of the world;[163] and this one they place in a lower [568]
position and reckon as second in rank to the first. In addition, they even fabricate an account of a third, the World Soul, which has by no means been allotted perfect existence on its own, although, by its relation to the superior Intellect, it is rendered more divine and more powerful in its ability to give life.

8.27 I will make mention of their actual statements and will put their own ideas on the table, so that my readers may realize that the Christians' view of God has been sharpened to a straight edge[164] and that the most excellent and wise persons among the Greeks, who have won an illustrious and much talked-about name precisely for their wisdom, may be exposed as lagging behind our own doctrinal precision, though they nonetheless do not entirely fail to follow our views.[165]

Accordingly, Porphyry, in the fourth book of his *Philosophical History*, writes,

> For Plato said the substance of God[166] proceeded as far as three hypostases, with the highest god being the Good, and after it in second place the Craftsman, and the World Soul as the third; for divinity proceeded as far

[161] Cyril makes a clear allusion here to Porphyry's title for Plotinus' *Ennead* 5.1, which he had quoted (and cited by title) earlier at *c. Iul.* 2.46.20–22.

[162] Cyril is adopting the language of Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith (quoted below at *c. Iul.* 8.27.9–18, especially 8.27.17 where "Trinity" occurs).

[163] Julian himself uses the phrase "the proximate Craftsman" (προσεχὴς δημιουργός); see *c. Gal.* fr. 18.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.33.7) with note.

[164] Gk. ἀπεξεσμένον εἰς τὸ εὐθύ. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.

[165] For the following section, cf. Augustine, *C. D.* 10.23 and 10.29, where he discusses the relation between the Christian Trinity and Porphyry's divine triad.

[166] Gk.: τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ … οὐσίαν. In the version of this passage cited in *c. Iul.* 1.47.6, the text reads θείου in place of θεοῦ.

> as Soul. Finally, separation from God[167] begins from the point of bodily distinction. But those people we spoke about previously oppose this idea, claiming that one must not number the Good with those realities that come from it since it is removed from all communion on account of the fact that it is simple in every respect and does not accept concurrence with
> [569] anything else; and [they say that] from Intellect onwards (for this is [their] first principle), the Trinity is preserved as one.[168]

So then, we ourselves hardly confess three gods, but rather completely repudiate polytheism. Nevertheless, we have placed our faith in one consubstantial Trinity that consists in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and, indeed, by gathering together those named into a single nature of divinity, we rush down the straight and unerring path. We hold neither that the Son is inferior in some respect to the Father, nor that the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son, but instead that they have equality and likeness in each and every respect. For how could a single nature admit difference in itself?[169] So once and for all, it is sufficient for us that we are not misleading people when we say that the elite ranks of the Greeks themselves also held this view and thought the deity, or rather the divine and ineffable nature, proceeded as far as three *hypostases*, and that they too have made mention of the Trinity.

8.28 Furthermore, we will see as clear as day that they also believe that the Word of God exists and they call God "Father." For Plato said the following in the *Epinomis*:

[167] Gk.: τὸ ἄθεον.

[168] The first half of this quotation (= *c. Iul.* 8.27.9–13, i.e., up to and including the sentence on corporeal differentia) is Porphyry, *Phil. Hist.* 4, fr. 221 Smith. However, the GCS editors, following the arguments of Marie-Odile Boulnois, regard the quotation as continuing to *c. Iul.* 8.27.18, as do we also. Cf. Boulnois 2020a, 458–62; see also Schrader 1888, 365–66. Cyril quoted this passage already at *c. Iul.* 1.47, though here he provides a more extensive version. The author of the *De Trinitate* attributed to Didymus the Blind likewise cited the shorter version of the passage at *Trin.* 2.27 (PG 39.760b) and may have been Cyril's source for the citation in book 1 of *c. Iul.*, though, if so, the more extensive version here in book 8 shows that Cyril had access to the text in some form beyond simply the fragment cited in *Trin*. It is hard to identify "those people" mentioned in the latter half of the fragment whom Porphyry is opposing. If they seek to separate the Good from enumeration with what comes from it, then the "Trinity" they affirm must be a different triad from the one set out by Porphyry in the first half (the Good, the Craftsman, and the World Soul). Beginning with Intellect (the first principle), perhaps these individuals hold to a Trinity of Intellect, Soul, and Body, corresponding to the second, third, and fourth levels mentioned by Porphyry. That is, Porphyry's divine "Trinity" (if he were to use the word) consists of the highest three levels of reality and stops at body, the point at which separation from God begins, while his opponents separate the highest level of reality from all else and instead posit a "Trinity" of the second, third, and fourth levels.

[169] *c. Iul.* 8.27.19–27 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 864.

> And let us render them honors, not assigning the year to one of them, the month to another, and to still others no share or any time in which it traverses its orbit, as it joins in completing the cosmos which the Word, the most divine thing of all, has ordained;[170] the happy man first admired it and then conceived a desire to learn fully all that a mortal can.[171]

And he has also written in his letter to Hermias, Erastus, and Coriscus, [570]

> There being three of you, you must all read this letter, together if possible, but, if not, by twos as often as you possibly can in common, and you must treat it as a covenant and a law and an authority, which is just; and with an earnestness in concert with the Muses, combined with the training[172] that is sister to earnestness, you must swear by the God of all, the Ruler of what is and what shall be, and by the Father and Lord of the Ruler and Cause, whom we shall come to know, if we practice philosophy correctly.[173]

Observe how clearly[174] he says the cosmos was set in order by the divine Word. For he fashions all things, applying order and harmony to them, since he is the "power and wisdom"[175] of the Father, and with the Father he rules over all those things that came to be through him. Moreover, Plato says that person is "happy" and blessed who "marvels" at him and "desires to learn" who he is and how great he is.[176] Yet the fact that the human intellect proves inadequate for an exact contemplative vision of the Word is hinted at when he says, "then he conceived a desire to learn all that a mortal can." For "we see" matters pertaining to God "in a mirror and in a riddle," according to the statement of the blessed Paul.[177] Moreover, he has also explicitly and clearly made mention of "the Lord"

[170] At the end of this clause the received Platonic text includes the word ὁρατόν ("ordained *to be visible*"), which Cyril omits.

[171] Ps-Plato, *Epin*. 986c1–7. This passage was also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.16.1 and Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.77. Eusebius, like Cyril, omitted the word ὁρατόν (see previous note), as does Theodoret.

[172] Cyril, following Eusebius, has the word παιδείᾳ ("training") while the received Platonic text reads παιδιᾷ ("playfulness").

[173] Plato, *Ep*. 6.323c6–d5. This passage was also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.16.2, who was probably Cyril's source (a conclusion supported by the fact that both authors quote this passage after quoting from the Ps-Platonic *Epin.*, and both authors share significant variants of the Greek text that differ from earlier citations in Christian sources as well as from the independent manuscript tradition of Plato). Overlapping portions of the passage were also quoted by Clement, *Str*. 5.14.102.4 (quoted in Eusebius, *P.e.* 13.13.28); Origen, *Cels*. 6.8; Theodoret, *Affect*. 2.71. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 157–59.

[174] Interestingly, this adverb was included in the final clause of the passage from Plato's *Ep.* 6, which Cyril had omitted from his quotation, although it was preserved in Eusebius' own quotation of Plato at *P.e.* 11.16.2.

[175] Cf. 1 Cor 1:24. [176] Cyril echoes the language of Ps-Plato's just-cited *Epin.* 986c5–6.

[177] 1 Cor 13:12.

and "Father" of the Word, whom, he says, we too "shall come to know if we practice philosophy correctly."[178] Consequently, if someone does not
[571] know him, he is not practicing philosophy correctly, but raises his eyebrow in vain, is in an ignorant and delirious state, and does not perceive that he has charged ahead to the fullest extent of stupidity. In fact, we hold that the most excellent Julian must have been suffering from this condition, since he dared to do away with the existence of the Word of God as far as he was able.

8.29 And it would do no harm if, in addition to those passages we have just cited, we were to pile up other quotations from philosophers which in no respect oppose Plato's views. Numenius, for example, at one point says the following:

> Someone who is to gain an understanding of the first god and the second must first distinguish each part of the question with some sense of its order and proper placement and then, but only then, once these several parts should seem well disposed, he must attempt to speak in an orderly manner, or else not at all. […] Calling upon[179] god to be his own guide and to show us by the Word[180] the treasury of his thoughts, we begin[181] as follows: […] The first god, existing in himself, is simple, due to the fact that, being entirely together with himself, he can never be divided. The second god and the third [god], however, are the one.[182]

A little later he says,

> Indeed, the first god must be considered the father of the god who is the Craftsman.[183]

[178] Cyril adopts the language of Plato's just-cited *Ep.* 6.323d4–5.

[179] Cyril here has the nominative singular participle προσκαλεσάμενος in place of the nominative plural προσκαλεσάμενοι in Eusebius' text. Cyril's reading violates usual Greek syntax by not agreeing with the plural verb ἀρχόμεθα ("let us begin") that follows. Perhaps the ungrammatical nature of his version of the text has something to do with the fact that he has omitted the two immediately preceding lines from Eusebius.

[180] Gk.: τῷ λόγῳ. Though Numenius probably intended this as a reference to the philosopher's "reason," Cyril no doubt took it as a mention of the divine Word.

[181] Whereas Eusebius has the subjunctive ἀρχώμεθα ("let us begin"), Cyril has the indicative ἀρχόμεθα ("we begin").

[182] Numenius, fr. 11 des Places. Eusebius, no doubt Cyril's source, had quoted this passage at *P.e.* 11.18.1–3 (with some lacunae and variants, most notably the omission in Eusebius of an article before the final "one"). Cyril omitted two lines of the fragment from Eusebius, noted above in bracketed ellipses: "There is a saying that the treasure of someone who gets to work prematurely, before the first steps have been prepared, will turn to dust"; and "we should pray, and we must make our distinctions" (trans. Boys-Stones 2018, 179, lightly modified). Eusebius' version of the passage goes on for a few more lines than what Cyril has cited.

[183] Numenius, fr. 12 des Places, cited also in Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.18.6. Eusebius' fragment is much larger than just this one line that Cyril has excerpted. On these two passages from Numenius, see Boulnois, SC 624, 160–64.

Observe that not only does he too say that God exists,[184] being "one" and "simple," and, in addition to this, also indivisible, but he also says that both the second and third are "the one," presumably because he gathers together those named into a unity of natures as we do, even if he incorrectly names them "second" and "third god," thereby contradicting his own ideas, at least so it seems to me. For although Numenius says they are one, he in turn separates them into three, treating each individually [572] one-by-one, despite the fact that he said God must be named "father of the Craftsman."

8.30 And, in addition, Plotinus, who was extremely inquisitive[185] and had, so to speak, traversed practically every kind of subtle argumentation, at one point says the following about the Good:

> What, then, must we say about that which is most perfect? Nothing can come from it except what is next greatest after it. And the greatest thing after it, the second greatest thing, is Intellect. For Intellect sees the One and is in need of it alone. But the One has no need of Intellect. And that which is generated from something greater than Intellect is Intellect; and Intellect is greater than all other things, because other things come after it. For example, Soul is an expressed principle[186] derived from Intellect and a certain activity, just as Intellect is an activity of the One. But since Soul is a reflection of Intellect, its expressed principle is murky, and, for this reason, it must look to Intellect. Similarly, Intellect has to look to the One, in order for it to be Intellect. It beholds the One not as though it were separated from it, but because it comes after it and there is nothing in between, just as there is nothing in between Soul and Intellect.[187]

[184] This sentence presents a particularly knotty textual problem. It reads οὗτος ἕνα μὲν καὶ ἁπλοῦν ὄντα τε καὶ εἶναὶ φησι τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρός γε τούτῳ καὶ ἀδιαίρετον. The difficulty comes from the phrase τε καί which typically joins two coordinate words in the same class with the same syntactical function, whereas here it joins a participle and an infinitive, with the participle presumably being dependent upon the infinitive. Some sort of emendation seems necessary and various solutions are possible. We have opted to remove the τε καί, since this is the simplest resolution. Alternatively, it may be that a word has dropped out of the text, either a participle coordinate with ὄντα or an infinitive coordinate with εἶναι. We are grateful to Marie-Odile Boulnois for drawing this issue to our attention. For further discussion, see her lucid comments at SC 624, 344 n. 1.

[185] The term translated as "inquisitive" is φιλοζητητής, literally meaning "lover of questions," which is only found in Cyril's corpus. At times it has a negative association (*Mal.* 2:14–15 [2.589.24 Pusey]; *Jo.* 1:32–33 [1.178.13–14 Pusey]; *Ep. Fest.* 24.3 [PG 77.889d]; *Is.* 41:16–17 [PG 70.840c]), but he can also use it in a positive sense (*Jo.* 1:17; 3:36 [1.151.26; 1.260.26 Pusey]).

[186] The phrase "expressed principle" translates λόγος.

[187] Plotinus 5.1.6.39–49, trans. modified from Gerson et al. 2018, 540–41. Eusebius had quoted a portion of this passage in *P.e.* 11.17.7, and Theodoret, probably following Eusebius, included a smaller part of it at *Affect.* 2.82. Cyril begins his quotation at the same point as Eusebius, but Eusebius' version stops after "because other things come after it." Note that this is the same section of Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica* in which the fragments of Numenius just cited by

Now by "Intellect" he means the one who, according to us, is God the Word, since we ourselves in fact also call it "Wisdom," though not at all taking it to be in some respect inferior or second to the Father's preeminence and glory. Nor indeed do we maintain that God the Word, as if lacking self-perfection, is made perfect by beholding the Father, as the Greeks think: [they hold that], on the one hand, Intellect is in need of the first cause and contemplates it, in order that it might be greatly enriched with a perfect state of being as far as its
[573] own conditions are concerned, while, on the other hand, Soul, said to be the third from the first cause, is analogously in need of contemplation and participation in Intellect (which they also name the "second cause") in order that it too might receive some benefit. Nevertheless, by holding such views and degrading these realities, which they find so marvelous, into dissimilar natures, the Greeks are in fact merely exulting in insipid and puerile ideas. We, in contrast, maintain that the Father exists in pure perfection, and so also does the Son, as perfect from perfect, and indeed the Holy Spirit does as well. For the divine and ineffable nature stands in need of absolutely no external supplement but is enriched with perfection, and this derives from its own nature and applies for every single one of those dignities that are suitable to it and it alone.

8.31 Nonetheless, we will find an awareness of the holy Trinity also among these very Greek wise men. For they hold that they[188] are joined with one another in the closest proximity and without anything intervening, and the position that the Intellect would have in relation to the first is, they maintain, the same as the position the Soul, which is third, has in relation to the Intellect, which is second after the first. And, in turn, we will see that they even allow the imagery of an offspring and indeed also of a parent, since Plotinus has written as follows:

> Everything longs for its begetter and loves it, especially whenever the begetter and that which is begotten are one. And whenever the begetter is that which is also inseparable,[189] it necessarily follows that [what is

Cyril also appear, so it is plausible that perusing Eusebius' treatise inspired Cyril to turn to Plotinus at this point in his argument. Nevertheless, the fact that his version of the passage extends farther than Eusebius' extract proves that he must have drawn it from some other source, presumably a copy of the *Enneads*. On the passages from Plotinus quoted by Cyril in book 8, see Boulnois, SC 624, 173–86.

188 The αὐτά here ("they") refers to the three *hypostases* of the Trinity.

189 Gk.: ἀόριστον; on the meaning of this term, see Boulnois, SC 624, 179–80, 349 n. 4, 350 nn. 2–3.

> begotten] coexists with it, such that it is separated [from it] solely by being different.[190]

You hear how he said that what is begotten certainly must in every respect coexist with its begetter, due presumably to their inseparability[191] or natural proximity and the fact that nothing lies between them, and that they are separated by difference alone, and this is presumably not at all a difference in terms of nature; rather, the begetter seemingly has just [574] one difference with the begotten – the fact that one of them has done the begetting while the other one has been begotten.

Furthermore, Hermes, their Thrice-Greatest, also says at one point about God, the sovereign artificer of the universe,

> For, as a perfect and wise being, he imposed order upon the disorder, so that the intelligent entities might rule and occupy the first rank as eldest and superior, while things sensible might be subject to these as second. Thus, that which is weighed down and heavier than the intelligent possesses within itself a wise craftsman-like Word, and its Word abounds in a craftsman-like nature, since it is generative and life-giving.[192]

As for the claim that the Word of God, being life-giving, is in all things that have been set in motion, this is something we ourselves maintain too. And the all-wise Paul will confirm this, since he has written, "There is one God who is over all and through all and in all."[193] For there would be no other way for that which has been brought into existence and set in motion from nonexistence to possess an unshakeably permanent well-being, if it did not have participation in the incorruptible and truly existent God. Hermes, therefore, knows that the "generative" and

[190] Plotinus 5.1.6.50–53, trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 541, modified. Eusebius had quoted this passage at *P.e.* 11.17.8, as did Theodoret at *Affect.* 2.83, both including a further two sentences beyond where Cyril stops. Cyril's version differs slightly from the manuscript tradition of the *Enneads*, as well as from the version in Eusebius and Theodoret. First, in the opening sentence, Cyril's version has the present participle γεννώμενον in place of the perfect participle γεγεννημένον, a negligible difference that does not affect the interpretation of the passage. Second, whereas Cyril has "especially when the begetter and that which is begotten *are one*" (ἓν ὥσι), the other witnesses have "especially when the begetter and that which is begotten *are alone*" (ὥσι μόνοι). Third, in the second line Cyril's version has "what is inseparable" (τὸ ἀόριστον) in place of "what is best" (τὸ ἄριστον) found in the other witnesses to the text, the latter being an allusion to Aristotle, *Metaph.* 14.4, 1091b10. These differences might indicate that Cyril was using a different version of Plotinus' *Enneads* from the one Eusebius had access to; so Grant 1964, 273.

[191] Gk.: ἀδιόριστον, for which LSJ gives "indesignate, undefined, indefinite," none of which seem to suit this context. The Byzantine lexicographers, however, glossed the word with the terms ἀδιαχώριστον and ἀχώριστον, which must be closer to what Cyril meant by the term. Cf. Ps-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀδιόριστον; Hesychius, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀδιόριστον; Suda, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀδιόριστον.

[192] *Corp.Herm.* fr. 35 Nock and Festugière. [193] Eph 4:6.

"life-giving" Son belongs to a creative nature, and belongs to a nature that is other than all those things receptive of the life that comes from
[575] him. And he makes everything in need of life alive in the Holy Spirit. For, as the Son himself at one point says, "The Spirit is the one who gives life,"[194] and the entire process of stabilizing what has come to be is accomplished by the Father through the Son in the Spirit.[195] The divine David, for instance, sings in the psalm, "By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established and by the Spirit of his mouth all their power."[196]

8.32 So when it comes to our own view, we are accustomed to inspect such matters in detail and from all angles with the keen eye of our understanding. But as for the elite ranks of the Greeks, in place of the Holy Spirit they introduce Soul, as I said, as a third, under whose influence every living being is animated, since it infuses them with life, and they have assigned to it the powers and activities of the Holy Spirit. Plotinus, for instance, writes as follows about it:

> So, let every soul first consider the fact that it[197] made all living beings by breathing life into them, those that are nourished by the earth and those by the sea, those in the air, and divine stars in the sky. Soul itself made the sun and this great heaven, and it ordered it, and makes it revolve in a regular way, being a different nature from that which it orders and from that which it moves and makes alive. And it is necessarily more valuable than these, since, while these are generated and fall into corruption whenever Soul, which supplies them with life, departs from them, Soul itself exists forever by not departing from itself.[198]

So, as I said, God the Father acts upon the creation through the Son and in the Spirit, and he moves into existence those things that at one time did not exist and sustains in well-being those things that have come to be, and he ordained a perfectly beautiful order for them, along with
[576] proper rhythm and laws in accordance with which individual things may exist. For example, he has set the sun as the ruler of the day, and the moon as ruler of the night. Furthermore, it is established that the divine and life-giving Holy Spirit is "a nature different"[199] from everything that has been put in motion by it; for it is the Spirit of the ingenerate God,

[194] John 6:63. [195] On this Trinitarian formula, see the note at *c. Iul.* 3.34.21. [196] Ps 32(33):6.
[197] Gk.: αὐτή, referring to Soul.
[198] Plotinus 5.1.2.1–9, trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 534, modified. The variations between Cyril's version of this passage and Plotinus' text in the manuscript tradition are minor.
[199] Cf. Plotinus 5.1.2.6, quoted at *c. Iul.* 8.32.11 above.

being proper to him and proceeding from him with its own *hypostasis*[200] and possessing life and eternal existence because it belongs to the one who exists, and it fills all things and contains the universe, since it indeed is also consubstantial with the one who fills all things and is indivisibly everywhere; for all things are full of it. For it is written, "The Spirit of the Lord has filled the world."[201]

8.33 Plotinus, for instance, once again says the following about the "World Soul," using this term, I believe, in place of "Holy Spirit":

> Its power and nature would be more manifest and clearer if one were to consider how Soul encompasses heaven by its own acts of will. For Soul has given itself to the entire extent of heaven, however much that is, and every interval both great and small is ensouled, with different bodies moving in different directions, one existing here and another there, some in mutual opposition while others are dependent upon one another in other ways. Soul, however, is not like that, and it does not make things [577]
> alive by a portion of Soul, as though it were chopped up into individual parts; rather, all things are alive by the whole of it, and it is present everywhere, being likened to the Father who begat it both in its oneness and in its omnipresence.[202]

Is he not then in this passage quite clearly describing for us in the plainest terms the craftsman-like, life-giving operation of the Holy Spirit? For, as I said, he moves those things that are moved and sustains, ensouls, and gives life to the universe, and is not a nature different from that of the Father or the Son, but is like the spirit[203] in us – I mean in terms of having the properties of connaturality and consubstantiality.

Furthermore, one could also learn the point I am making from what Plotinus himself sees fit to think and say. For he writes as follows:

> So, take Soul's higher neighboring region, after which and from which Soul comes, as more divine than this divine thing.[204] Even though Soul is one thing, as our argument has shown, it is an image of Intellect. Just as a

[200] Gk.: ἐνυπόστατον. On this term, see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.28. [201] Wis 1:7.

[202] Plotinus 5.1.2.27–38, trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 535, modified. The variations between Cyril's version of this passage and Plotinus' text in the manuscript tradition are notable: e.g., Cyril has ἐνθυμηθείη in place of ἐνταῦθα διανοηθείη in the opening line; Cyril omits the phrase καὶ ἄγει that Plotinus has following περιέχει; Cyril has the perfect δέδωκεν in place of the aorist ἔδωκεν; Cyril has κινουμένου instead of κειμένου. The first sentence in this passage was also alluded to in Ps-Basil, *Eun.* 5 (PG 29.769c), though the author did not mark it as a citation.

[203] Gk.: αὐτό. The mss here read αὐτός. We follow Vinzent's conjectural emendation. For discussion, cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 359 n. 2, who opts for αὐτοί.

[204] The Intellect is Soul's higher neighbor here and, as such, is named more divine than Soul.

> word uttered[205] is an image of a word in the soul, so, too, Soul is the Intellect's word and its whole activity, which it sends forth as life to make something else really exist,[206] just as fire has heat that it retains and heat that it furnishes [to others].[207]

Observe that in this passage he even says Soul is an image of Intellect and, in addition, he also thinks it a good idea to liken it to the spoken word that emerges from the intellect, so that it even "sends forth life" to make other things really exist,[208] just as, for example, also happens with heat that goes forth from fire. So the Greeks themselves have also used
[578] such exceedingly subtle examples, without which it is impossible to speak about theology,[209] since it is beyond language and darts past every intellect.[210]

8.34 Given the rather lengthy digression we have been through, it is now necessary to bring our discussion back to the original point. The fact that the God-breathed scriptures name God "one" does not preclude the Son being God by nature. Rather, the naming of God as "one" is an attack on those who stand for the polytheistic error. For it keeps us from being led away from the God who truly exists according to nature and prevents us from worshipping the creation and going off in some other direction, far from the path that leads straight to the truth. Hence, even if God should say, "I alone stretched out the heaven and have established the earth,"[211] the person who is eager to learn must recognize the identity of the one who stretched out the heaven and established the earth, as I said previously. As the saying of the psalmist has it, "By the word of the Lord the heavens were established," and "he founded the earth upon its secure foundation."[212]

[205] Plotinus here employs the classic Stoic distinction between an interior word (ἐνδιάθετος λόγος) and an expressed word (προφορικὸς λόγος), which also was frequently used by Christian authors to describe the relation between the Father and Son. On Cyril's use of this analogy, see Boulnois 1994, 138–42.

[206] Gk.: εἰς ἄλλου ὑπόστασιν. Cyril typically uses the word ὑπόστασις to refer to the persons of the Trinity, which we have elsewhere transliterated. Here it refers to the individual existence of each existing thing. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.48.1–5.

[207] Plotinus 5.1.3.4–10, trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 536, modified. The only notable departure of Cyril's version from the Plotinian manuscript tradition, and it is a minor one, is the addition of ἓν ("one") before οὖσα χρῆμα, so that it reads "even though Soul is one thing," rather than simply "Soul is the kind of thing shown by the argument."

[208] Gk.: εἰς ἑτέρων ὑπόστασιν. [209] Gk.: τὰ περί θεοῦ.

[210] We follow the GCS emendation: *νοῦ{ν}*. [211] Isa 44:24.

[212] Ps 32(33):6; 103(104):5. Theodoret also cites Ps 32(33):6 in connection with Plotinus' theology (*Affect.* 2.86).

Julian

But if, Julian says,[213] *the Word is "God from God," as you claim, and was "begotten from the Father's substance,"*[214] *why do you say that the virgin is God-bearing?*[215] *For how could she give birth to God, when she is a human like us?*[216] [579]

And in addition to this he says,[217] *When God plainly states, "I am <God> and besides me there is no one who saves,"*[218] *do you dare say that her son is a savior?*[219]

Cyril

For he has also added the latter question to his own arguments. We must, therefore, make a thorough inquiry[220] into the manner of the only-begotten's incarnation, speaking with as much brevity as possible. But since we are casting into the ears of the Greeks the mystery – or rather our exposition of the Christological mystery – we will refrain from examining topics that are more ineffable and will instead discuss just a few things with them, gathering together some points based on plausible reasoning,[221] with the God-breathed scripture helping us in this endeavor.[222]

8.35 It seems to me necessary and very prudent that I should first lay out the reasons why, in our view, the mystery of the incarnation had to

[213] For the uncharacteristic abruptness of Cyril's quotation, with the simple belated insertion of "Julian says," see Boulnois, SC 624, 364 n. 1. Cf. *c. Iul.* 3.10.13.

[214] With the phrases "God from God" and "begotten from the Father's substance" (τῆς οὐσίας ἐξέφυ τοῦ πατρός) Julian is alluding to the Nicene Creed. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 64.8 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.11).

[215] Greek: θεοτόκον. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 64.35 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.16.14).

[216] The idea that God could be born from a human mother was also rejected by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 1.69; 6.73), as well as the anonymous Hellene in Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.22.

[217] Neumann and Masaracchia included the opening words of this sentence (Καί πρός γε τούτῳ) as part of Julian's fragment, but the GCS edition treats it as Cyril's introductory formula; see Boulnois, SC 624, 364–65 n. 5.

[218] Isa 43:11.

[219] *c. Gal.* fr. 65 Mas.; Wright 1923, 400–01.

[220] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῆσαι; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[221] Gk.: τὰ ἐξ εἰκότων … λογισμῶν. Note that with his use of "plausible" (εἰκότων), Cyril is echoing the passage from Plato, *Ti.* 40de quoted at *c. Iul.* 8.25; 8.45. Whereas Plato said we must believe the children of the gods even if their accounts lack "plausible or compelling proofs," in the remainder of book 8 Cyril will lay out what he takes to be the "plausible" account of the fulfillment of prophecy in the incarnation, which ought to lead one to faith.

[222] As observed by Boulnois (SC 624, 367 n. 2), this sentence suggests that Cyril is envisioning an audience of readers for his treatise that includes not only Christians but also unconverted Hellenes and that he limits his subsequent exposition accordingly so that it does not reveal too much of the mystery to those who have not been initiated into the Christian church. For a similar passage, see *c. Iul.* 7.42.1–6.

come to pass.[223] When heaven and earth and altogether everything in
[580] them had been brought into existence, the human body was fashioned from earth. This body, being ensouled by the ineffable strength of the Craftsman of all, was immediately a rational living creature, most God-like in form, since he was made according to the image of his Creator. And no one would doubt that, since he is the handiwork of a good God, he was brought into existence, not to do the basest of deeds, but to do all those that are praiseworthy. He was, however, made autonomous and free, with the permission to rush about according to the inclinations of his own will, to whatever he might choose, whether something good or bad.

Next, though he had received from God the command that he must not eat from the tree "in the middle of paradise"[224] as a sort of regimen to train him in ready obedience and the exercise of virtue, he proved careless and easily distracted. For he was caught having failed to keep the order that was given, yielding to such a slight pleasure, and suffering from impotence with respect to self-control. And since he thought, in addition to this, that he might even become a god (for Satan had tricked him by saying this), he was put under a curse, seeing that he in fact had both committed an offense against a divine law and had designs that went beyond his nature. Next, he was sentenced to death and exposed for who he is by nature, even though he was created not to be subject to the bonds of death and easily captured, but so that he might, contrary to nature, even transcend evil.[225] And absolutely nothing is impossible for the Craftsman of all, nor would it be hard for him to render even that
[581] which is tyrannized by corruption (insofar as it depends upon the principles of its own nature) superior to corruption and to preserve it for a life that is long-lasting.[226] For he is the same one who, as seemed good to him and him alone, also defined for the very natures themselves the laws that determine whether or not they should be the kind of thing they happen to be. And absolutely nothing is difficult for him or able to resist him.

8.36 Therefore, when the first man, that is Adam, had been convicted of the charge of disobedience and found himself unexpectedly enmeshed in the snares of death[227] and indeed even ruined by sin thanks to the

[223] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.35.1–3; 8.35.10–13; 8.35.24–28 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.152–55; 15.4.8–10; 15.4.1–3 (Boulnois 2020b, 175).
[224] Cf. Gen 3:3. [225] Gk.: τοῦ κακοῦ, so possibly "the evil One." Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.9.21–22.
[226] *c. Iul.* 8.35.19–28 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 866.
[227] *c. Iul.* 8.36.1–3 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 868.

unholy scheming of that foul dragon who is the source of all evil – I mean Satan (for he was the one who set the entire trap for Adam) – and when this evil had ravaged the entire race that came from Adam, with death reigning even up to Moses,[228] or rather up to the period of the law, the Craftsman then, taking note of our injured state, deigned to help us and he showed compassion towards us who were living miserable lives. For it was necessary, yes necessary, that God, being also good, should come to the aid of those who had been utterly destroyed and should render the devil's envy ineffective; that he should reconstitute earthly humanity that had been disfigured, forging it anew into incorruptibility and rendering it beyond suffering, with humanity having received amnesty from its ancient errors; and that he should make it a steward of virtue and every good deed. For "there was no one who does good, not [582]
even one," as the statement of the psalmist goes.[229] Indeed, the multitude of the Greeks were entirely unaware of the Craftsman and bereft of the God who exists according to nature, and, foolishly turning aside from the straight path, they were even led astray into the inevitable worship of those gods who do not exist at all, living a hedonistic life more appropriate for animals. As for the Jews, being burdened by the condemning law and neglecting in no small measure the commandment that came through Moses, they were subject to the penalties for their transgressions but nonetheless could scarcely stop sinning.

8.37 Hence, when all the inhabitants of the earth had been carried off into the most extreme miseries of all, and when Moses had explicitly admitted that he was insufficient to save them (for he says clearly, "Please, Lord, appoint another capable person whom you shall send"),[230] and when the holy prophets themselves had also lost heart in this endeavor (for the divine David had cried out, "You who sit upon the cherubim, appear! […] raise up your dominance and come to save us";[231] and once again Isaiah, "Lord, who has believed our report?";[232] and in addition Jeremiah was grieved because his preaching failed to accomplish swiftly the goal he had hoped for, since no one repented, and thus cried out, "Woe is me, O mother! What sort of person have you given birth to?! A man condemned and at variance with the whole land! I neither gave help nor did anyone help me")[233] – in light of all this, what then was

[228] Cf. Rom 5:14. [229] Ps 13(14):3, cited also in Rom 3:12. [230] Exod 4:13.
[231] Ps 79(80):2c, 3bc. Cyril omits Ps 79(80):3a from his citation ("Before Ephraim and Benjamin and Manasseh").
[232] Isa 53:1. [233] Jer 15:10.

the Craftsman of the universe supposed to do? Should he have surren-
[583] dered the inhabitants of the earth to be ruled by the unclean daemons, and let the devil's envy prevail over his own plans? Should he not have saved those who were in danger? Should he not have stretched out his saving hand to those who were lying wounded?[234] Should he not have conducted those who were trapped in the most shameful deeds to something better? Should he not have illuminated the intellect of those in darkness? Should he not have turned back that which had been misled? How then could he have been good if he took no account of us despite having it within himself to do all these things without any effort at all? Why in the first place did he even bring us into existence and life at all, if he has no compassion towards us when we have suffered such unexpected misfortunes and fared badly?[235]

8.38 Since, therefore, every holy person had given up on coming to the aid of the inhabitants of the earth and indeed they had a well-founded excuse for doing so (since it was his task and his alone to unsettle death's oppressive reign, to remit humanity's penalty, to free them from their errors, to cheer their hearts, to tame the wild beast who was the avenging spirit, to unnerve the foul mass of daemons, and to set straying humanity upon the paths of well-being), the Father helped by sending from heaven his own Son, who in fact even put on a human form, in order that, by living together with
[584] us as a human, he might render us thrice-blest and beyond every evil. For since the living and subsistent[236] Word of the Father is unchangeable and immutable in terms of his nature as God, he did not fashion a body united with himself from his own nature, but instead received it from us, and not from the sleep and pleasure of a virile man,[237] but from the holy virgin, in a strange and novel manner beyond the laws of nature.[238] For it was necessary, yes necessary, that he should have such a birth – I mean his birth in the flesh from a woman – in order that his arrival into the world and manifestation might have an appropriately divine character.

Moreover, as I said, there is nothing whatsoever that is hard to set aright for one who is omnipotent, and to disbelieve those things he is

[234] Cyril is here probably deliberately echoing Julian's claim that Asclepius "stretched out his saving right hand over all the earth" in *c. Gal.* fr. 46 Mas., quoted at *c. Iul.* 6.22.22–23 and 8.50.17–18. The imagery, if not the exact phrasing, is also biblical: Ps 19(20):7; 137(138):7.

[235] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.37.20–24 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.125–32 (Boulnois 2020b, 175–76).

[236] Gk.: ἐνυπόστατος. On this term, see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.28.5.

[237] Cf. Wis 7:2.

[238] As observed by Boulnois (SC 624, 376 n. 3), this emphasis on the supernatural character of Christ's incarnation stands in contrast to Julian's earlier insistence that God's commands must conform to the laws of nature (*c. Gal.* fr. 26 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 4.40]).

said to have done is inexcusable, even if it should seem to someone that it does not directly follow from what is plausible. For this is simply how it is when it comes to matters that are miraculous. Therefore, even if the limit of our mind should perhaps be surpassed by the extraordinary quality of what was done, one must not for this reason dishonor the supernatural and ineffable nature by accusing it of impotence; it would instead be more appropriate to honor with uncritical approval[239] whatever it should be said to have accomplished. Otherwise, it would arguably not be unreasonable even to refuse to believe that he is the Craftsman of the universe at all.[240] For who among us is able to understand and explain in what manner this immense heaven, along with the sun and moon and all the rest, were raised up and became visible?[241] [585]

8.39 Therefore, taking from the holy virgin the all-holy body animated with an intellectual soul, he came forth as a human, though without destroying his existence as God or indeed casting off the dignity of his own preeminence, since he exists, as I said, knowing no change. For as Plotinus says,

> For why should it seek to change when it is in a good state? Where could it go when it has all things within itself? Nor does it seek growth since it is absolutely perfect. For this reason, all the things in it are also perfect, in order that it might be perfect in every way, having nothing which is not like it, nothing in itself that it does not think. And it thinks not by seeking but by having. Its blessedness is not acquired, but rather is possessed for all eternity.[242]

The only-begotten Word of God accordingly became incarnate while not abandoning his existence as God. Moreover, the manner of the economy[243] with the flesh was miraculous and beyond both our intellect and language.

And this truly great and sacred mystery did not just appear yesterday, nor was it something new or the invention of a mind that loves innovation, but was most ancient, existing in God's foreknowledge "before the foundation of the world."[244] We should in fact be able to perceive this point through the God-breathed scripture. For we certainly do not claim [586]

[239] Gk.: ψήφοις. [240] Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.25.18–21; 10.41.6–9; fr. 59.

[241] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.38.23–31 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.109–14 (Boulnois 2020b, 176).

[242] Plotinus 5.1.4.12–17, trans. Gerson et al. 2018, 537, modified. The subject of this passage is specifically νοῦς ("Intellect"), which a few paragraphs above Cyril has identified with God the Word of Trinitarian theology.

[243] Gk.: οἰκονομίας. [244] 1 Pet 1:20.

that the divine and pure intellect, "in which," as it is written, "are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,"[245] did not know that the human race, after sliding into error, would be subject to punishment and a curse, and would be subjected to death and corruption. Rather, the human race would not carry the damage resulting from this as something indelibly and permanently stuck to it, but would through faith in Christ strip off its sin along with death and would run back to its original state and settle into a life that is sacred and pure.

8.40 We therefore hold that knowledge of the mystery was given to Abraham before anyone else. The Son himself, for instance, addressed the crowds of the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day, and he saw it and was glad."[246] Moreover, those persons who came from him, I mean Isaac and Jacob and those after them all the way up to
[587] the all-wise Moses, used to learn in riddles the meaning of the mystery "in many and varied ways."[247] Moses, for instance, was prefiguring it when he commanded those descended from Israel in Egypt to sacrifice the lamb as a type of Christ, and to smear themselves with the blood, thereby inducing them to put the destroyer to shame with a mere shadow – the very thing that actually did happen.[248] For they were saved, and he rendered them superior to the inevitable process of corruption. And this was still a mere type of the truth! And then there is also Jesus the child of Nave, who had the same name as the true one.[249] For he led the children of Israel across the Jordan and circumcised them with stone knives, and he also guided them "into the land of promise."[250]

After him, you will also see Samuel, who was best at giving prophecies, sacrificing a lamb and dedicating it "as a pleasing aroma"[251] to God and also pouring water over the sacrifices. Then, when wars were impending and an innumerable phalanx of foreigners was ravaging Judea, he conquered them without a fight and saved those who were in danger.[252] For the mystery of Christ is lifesaving for those who believe in him.

8.41 And, in addition, all the rest of the chorus of the holy prophets have proclaimed the mystery in advance. For instance, God made a

[245] Col 2:3. [246] John 8:56. [247] Cf. Heb 1:1.

[248] See Exod 12:21–28. Exodus does not actually record the Israelites smearing blood upon themselves, but rather upon the doorways of their houses. See also Cyril, *Jo.* 8:32 (2.60 Pusey), where Cyril again mentions the Israelites smearing blood upon themselves, adding that they also did the same to their doorways.

[249] Cyril alludes to the fact that the LXX rendered Joshua's name as Ἰησοῦς (Jesus).

[250] Cf. Josh 3, 5:3 (and Heb 11:9 for the last phrase).

[251] A phrase that is common in the LXX and also found in the New Testament. Cf. Exod 29:18; Eph 5:2.

[252] Cf. 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 7.

pledge to the divine David and said, "From the fruit of your loins I will place [an heir] upon your throne,"[253] and because he had an unwavering [588]
conviction that the promise in all its fullness would certainly come to pass no matter what, David proclaims far and wide the manner of the incarnation, saying at one point, "God will come in visible manner, and he will not pass by in silence,"[254] and again on another occasion he says to God, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever. A rod of uprightness is the rod of your rule. You loved justice and hated injustice. Therefore, O God, your God anointed you with the oil of rejoicing in the presence of your companions."[255] You see that God is anointed by God. How then do we say this was done? When he became human, while remaining exactly what he was before, it was then that he, as a human, was anointed for a mission just like we are.[256] He became "the high priest and apostle of our confession," as it is written.[257] For he existed eternally and is in heaven and in this world here, and in short there is no place void of his presence. For he fills all things by the nature of his divinity. Yet the invisible has come to us in visible manner when he put on a form like ours.

Moreover, David himself will once more confirm that this one was destined to prevail over the earth under heaven and place the entire human race under his scepter, for he said the following to him, "All the nations that you made, they will come and worship before you, Lord."[258] [589]
And once more he said, "And let all the kings of the earth worship you; all the nations will serve him."[259] And again, "Bless our God, O nations."[260] And again, "Clap your hands, all you nations; cry aloud to God with a voice of rejoicing, because the Lord Most High is awesome, a great king over all the earth."[261] Do you see how he calls the one who has appeared in the flesh "God" and "Lord Most High" and "King"?

[253] Ps 131(132):11b. [254] Ps 49(50):2b–3a.

[255] Ps 44(45):7–8, cited also in Heb 1:8–9. Our translation of this biblical passage follows Cyril's interpretation of it in the subsequent sentence rather than the common reading that is found, e.g., in NETS. The key phrase is ἔχρισέ σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου (following the punctuation of the GCS edition of *c. Iul.*). Modern translations take the phrase ὁ θεός σου as appositional to ὁ θεός (i.e., "God, your God, anointed you"), but Cyril reads the phrase ὁ θεός as a vocative in apposition to σε, with ὁ θεός σου being the subject of the verb ("Your God anointed you, O God"). Either reading of the syntax is possible. In favor of Cyril's reading is that it parallels the phrasing and syntax of the first sentence of the passage: Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. Here there is no question that ὁ θεός is a vocative in apposition to σου (i.e., "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever").

[256] The last three sentences are also found as part of a fragment excerpted in the catena tradition and said to come from a homily by Cyril (*Hom. fr.* 6, 462.18–20 Pusey).

[257] Heb 3:1. The word in the last sentence translated as "mission" is ἀποστολή, cognate to the word translated as "apostle" (ἀπόστολος) in the citation from Hebrews.

[258] Ps 85(86):9ab. [259] Ps 71(72):11. [260] Ps 65(66):8. [261] Ps 46(47):2–3.

8.42 Furthermore, the son who was born from him, Solomon, was not unaware of the pledge given by God, for at one point he says the following as he lifts up supplications to God, "And now, Lord God of Israel, let your word to David my father be confirmed, if God really is going to dwell with humans upon the earth."[262] Baruch also indicated this when he said, "This is our God; no other will be reckoned along with him. He procured every path of knowledge and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel, his beloved. And after this he appeared on earth and lived together with humans."[263] Observe with what splendid clarity this man too says God was seen on earth and lived together with those on it!

Furthermore, Isaiah announced the good news of his miraculous birth according to the flesh, for he says, "Behold, the virgin will conceive and will bear a son, and they will call his name Emmanuel,"[264] that is, "God with us."[265] And once more, "Be strong, you weak hands and feeble
[590] knees! Give comfort, you who are faint of heart and mind! Be strong; do not fear! Behold our God, behold the Lord comes with strength and his arm with authority."[266] And once again, "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear. Then the lame will leap like a deer and the tongue of stammerers shall be clear."[267] And once more, "The voice of one calling out in the wilderness, 'Prepare the way of the Lord; make straight the paths of our God,'"[268] which is in fact what the divine John the Baptist did. So when the Jews asked him who he was and what was the purpose of his mission, he clearly pointed out the answer by saying the following: "I am the voice of one calling in the wilderness, 'Prepare the way of the Lord.'"[269] Moreover, Isaiah confirmed that, once the only-begotten had become incarnate, the calling of the nations was also soon to be accomplished, since he says, "Nations that do not know you shall call upon you, and peoples that do not understand you shall flee to you for refuge."[270]

8.43 Furthermore, another of the holy prophets says, "'Be glad and rejoice, daughter of Zion, since behold I am coming and I shall dwell in your midst,' says the Lord. And many nations will find refuge in the Lord
[591] on that day and will be a people for him."[271] And at one point even the God of the universe himself says to the holy prophets, "Say to the daughter Zion, 'See, your King is coming to you, saving and just is he,

[262] 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 8:26–27a. [263] Bar 3:36–38. [264] Isa 7:14. [265] Matt 1:23.
[266] This is an amalgamated quotation of Isa 35:3–4 and 40:9b–10a. The same combined version of these passages is in Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 4 (PG 46.212a).
[267] Isa 35:5–6a. [268] Isa 40:3. [269] John 1:23. [270] Isa 55:5. [271] Zech 2:10–11.

humble and mounted upon a beast of burden and a young foal.'"[272] For Christ went up to Jerusalem in this manner, sitting upon a foal.

Furthermore, the most wise Daniel says, "And I saw in a vision of the night, and behold, as it were a son of man was coming upon the clouds of heaven. And he came all the way up to the ancient of days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and honor and kingship. And all tribes and languages shall serve him."[273] Now I would have piled up, as I said, a great many other passages from the holy men as well (for the God-breathed scripture is full of such statements), had I not thought that doing so would be tedious beyond measure for everyone. Moreover, I think that even those that have been cited should be sufficient for "those who love the sight of the truth."[274]

8.44 Moreover, we will see from the following that the mystery also seemed marvelous to some of the Greek philosophers who were not insignificant and who acquired a reputation among them for being worthy of emulation. For instance, Amelius the Platonist, whose *floruit* coincided with Plotinus and Gentilianus at Rome (for this is what Porphyry says about them),[275] is said to have written the following:[276] [592]

> And this then was the Word, in accordance with whom, being eternal, the things that come to be were coming to be, as indeed would be the view of Heraclitus as well.[277] And, by Zeus, the barbarian considers [this one] to

[272] A combined quotation of Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9. These two verses were cited in a similarly combined form in Matt 21:5, though Cyril includes more of Zech 9:9 than the Matthean version does.

[273] Dan 7:13–14.

[274] Gk.: τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας φιλοθεάμοσιν, an allusion to the definition of the true philosopher in Plato, *R.* 5.475e4, a passage that Cyril cited above at *c. Iul.* 5.38.15, drawing it from Clement of Alexandria. A similar construction occurs at *c. Iul.* 5.28.27 ("those who love the sight of true piety").

[275] Cyril has misunderstood Porphyry by distinguishing between Amelius and Gentilianus, when in fact they were the same person. In his *Life of Plotinus*, Porphyry explicitly says that Amelius' family name was Gentilianus (*Plot.* 7). The philosopher is also mentioned in a long fragment from a lost work of Longinus that Porphyry cites at *Plot.* 20, in which he is called Gentilianus Amelius and once Gentilianus. Porphyry usually refers to him simply as Amelius (*Plot.* 1–5). Though Cyril has likely drawn the following extract from Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.19.1, Eusebius does not associate Amelius with Plotinus, but merely describes him as one of the "recent philosophers" who especially admired Plato. Hence, Cyril must have learned from another source that Amelius was in Rome with Plotinus, most likely finding this detail in Porphyry's *Life*. On Amelius, see further Brisson 1987 (especially 795–96 on his name).

[276] It is notable that in this instance Cyril alerts the reader to the fact that he has obtained this passage second-hand by his use of the circumlocution "he is said to have written" (γεγραφέναι λέγεται), whereas when he is drawing a quotation from an intermediate source he usually makes no indication of having done so (e.g., the passages from Numenius cited earlier in book 8 that he took from Eusebius' *P.e.*).

[277] Cf. Heraclitus, fr. B1 Diels/Kranz (= D1 Laks/Most).

> be established in the rank and dignity of a first principle[278] and so to "be with God and to be God," the one "through whose agency everything" has simply "come to be," and the one in whom that which comes to be is a living creature and "life" and comes to exist by nature. Next [he considers this one] to have fallen into bodies, and, having put on "flesh," to have appeared as human, while also showing the grandeur of his nature at the same time. And of course, after suffering dissolution, he is once more divinized and is God, such as he was prior to being drawn down into body and flesh and a human.[279]

I suspect he probably calls the divine John "barbarian" since he spoke a different language[280] (for he was "a Hebrew from the Hebrews"[281] and did not come from the country or land of the Greeks). Nevertheless, he is aware of the incarnate Word and confesses this, and he does not regard
[593] the word of the divine preaching as something to be rejected.

8.45 So then, the mystery of Christ was announced in advance through oracles, and a multitude of the holy men predicted this, even though they did not all live at one and the same time. Therefore, since ensuing events matched the statements of all of them and experience itself also confirms this loud and clear, it is incredible, in my view at least, that certain people choose total disbelief and, rising up in opposition to things that actually happened, almost rival deranged people, despite the fact that the elite ranks of the Greeks themselves arguably also thought doing so to be incredible. Plato, for example, said about their gods,

> As for the other daemons, to know or to talk about their origin is too great a task for us, and we must believe those who have previously discussed it, indeed those who claimed to be descendants of gods, since they know their own progenitors. It is, therefore, impossible to disbelieve children of gods, although they speak without plausible or compelling proofs; and inasmuch as they claimed to be reporting family affairs, let us follow custom and believe them.[282]

[278] This phrase could alternatively be translated "in the rank and dignity *of the beginning* (τῆς ἀρχῆς)" and thus begins a pastiche of phrasing from the prologue of John's gospel, which continues throughout the remainder of the fragment.

[279] This passage from a work of Amelius of unknown title was also cited by Eusebius, *P.e.* 11.19.1 and Theodoret, *Affect.* 2.88, with both Cyril and Theodoret probably being dependent upon Eusebius. Cf. Dillon 2009; Brisson 1987, 840–43; Dörrie 1972; Boulnois, SC 624, 164–72. The above translation follows that of Dillon, with some modifications.

[280] Gk.: τῆς γλώττης … τὸ ἑτερόθρουν; for this rare word which, aside from an entry in a lexicon, occurs only in Nonnus and Cyril, cf. *c. Iul.* 4.45.14; 7.7.11.

[281] Cf. Phil 3:5.

[282] Plato, *Ti.* 40de. The same passage was quoted above at *c. Iul.* 8.25.

Well, then, my dear friends, can you really admire the son of Aristo – even though he says that one must, "without plausible or compelling proofs," reward with credence the descendants of gods when they give reports about them – and at the same time be justified in invalidating the statements of the holy prophets and claiming that the words that came through the Holy Spirit are false? For although trustworthiness is not a quality one would in any sense reasonably ascribe to the descendants of the falsely named gods – for they have not done anything amazing! – nevertheless, when it comes to the holy prophets, the very beauty of their manner of life bears witness to them, as does their conspicuous relationship with God and the fact that they possessed a most abundant supply of power from him and so were able to accomplish things beyond our reach. [594]

8.46 Yet our opponents[283] will probably say, "But why did he become incarnate at all and put up with the flesh and filth that is in us, when in fact he had the ability – without any difficulty if indeed he truly is God, as you insist – by a mere nod of his head to change the hearts of the inhabitants of the earth with his ineffable power so that they would choose to adhere to what pleased him in their actions and thoughts and would feel a duty to live their lives as friends of God?"[284] My reply to this objection would be as follows. Did then the divine and pure Intellect miss its target, and did it go somewhat beyond what is plausible? And are we saying that it was not carried directly towards what is appropriate? Are we then superior in understanding to perfect Wisdom? Will a lamp compete with the sun? Will one drop of water be equal to this entire sea, wide and immeasurable as it is? Yet how could someone not admire the divine prophet Isaiah who cried out clearly and most sensibly, "Who measured the water with his hand and the sky with the span of his fingers and all the earth by the handful? Who weighed the mountains with a scale and the valleys with a balance? Who knew the mind of the Lord?"[285] For just as measuring the heaven with a span and all the earth with a handful is impossible, as is placing the mountains and forests on scales, so also it is out of the reach of every human being, or rather every [595]

[283] As observed by Boulnois (SC 624, 396 n. 1), from this point until the end of book 8, Cyril seems to move beyond Julian's actual text and to respond to criticisms of the incarnation brought by an anonymous group of Hellenes, a departure from his usual practice. The only other instance in which a criticism is attributed to a plural group of opponents in this fashion is *c. Iul.* 9.42.17–19.

[284] Celsus had previously made this criticism, and Origen responded, as Cyril does in *c. Iul.* 8.47, by appealing to free will as a necessary condition for virtue (*Cels.* 4.3).

[285] Isa 40:12–13a.

rational creature, to delineate and measure out the supernatural and supreme Intellect. Therefore, if there is someone who dares to say he is able to envision a better plan than perfect Wisdom can, let him go ahead and rebuke God, but he should know he is speaking nonsense. For this is madness and these are the words of a delirious man who is out of his mind. But if each and every person would agree that the human intellect is inferior to perfect Wisdom to the same degree that it also appears to fall short of it in terms of its nature, would it not then be wise to concede to it and to it alone the business of knowing what is most appropriate for it? For it would not have done something that did not have to be exactly as it happened.[286]

8.47 We can respond to this objection in another way also, since it seems to me that I must consider and discuss something else as well. Every rational and intelligent creature in heaven possesses a voluntary impulse towards whatever action it should choose and an inclination that in each instance is not constrained by necessity. For this was the only way possible for the good to be justly deemed worthy of approbation and
[596] rewards, and for the required censure to be decreed against the bad. Hence, in order that we ourselves too might voluntarily embark upon each and every good thing, God permitted humanity to conduct its life on earth with an uncoerced faculty of judgment. And this is the state in which he created humanity in the beginning. For humans are attached to the reins of their own will and carried along in either direction by inclinations under their command – either towards the good, that is, or its opposite.

Therefore, if God had used a certain ineffable and most divinely fitting power and operation to transport the intellect of each person towards good deeds and then made the good something involuntary and impossible to escape, the matter would no longer be a product of the faculty of judgment, nor would it be worthy of praise, but would instead be a result of necessity and involuntary instincts.[287] How then could we free the Craftsman from blame and indictment, if in the beginning he permitted humans to be steered by the reins of their own impulsive acts of will, but, after this point, yoked them to necessary changes in direction and tied them, as it were, with the rope of certain inescapable instincts to the inevitability of perfectly carrying out whatever was pleasing to them? And if it
[597] was better for humans to exist in this state, why did he not make them so

[286] For the sentiments expressed here, cf. Porphyry, *ad Nemert.* fr. 281 Smith (quoted at *c. Iul.* 3.19).
[287] Gk.: πλεονεξίας.

from the beginning, instead of changing his plans later with hindsight and struggling to bring them back to what is able to save them and changing them, not freely, but instead by coercion, so that they would inevitably have the appearance of being faithful? How then could it still be doubted, or rather how could it not be clear to everyone, that we will unavoidably and doubtlessly be accusing the divine and ineffable will of badly managing human affairs, of somehow getting diverted, as it were, from what is plausible, and of not seeing the blameless path at the outset? Away with such ill counsel! For it is pious to recoil at such musings.

8.48 It was, therefore, necessary that, not by coercion but instead by persuasion,[288] he should lead to tractability[289] those who had neglected the sacred pursuits and who had all but raised up the stiff and arrogant neck of their mind against God. For this reason, the only-begotten Word of God came forth as a human in a miraculous manner transcending human intellect and lived together with those on earth: partly by signs and wonders beyond human nature and ability he persuaded them to realize that he was God, born, as I said, in a form like us to meet our every need; and partly by instructions going beyond the law he indicated [598] to them the habits of true well-being, established them beyond Jewish pedantry, and illuminated the hearts of believers with the knowledge of the true understanding of God. For he is himself the truth,[290] the genuine offspring of God the Father.

So then, if we were to claim that a mere common human has been made into God and if we were to introduce another god into the holy and consubstantial Trinity, then doing so would be nothing other than worship of a human.[291] If, however, the God-breathed scriptures, on the contrary, prophesy that the one who is truly Son by nature, the Word who shone forth from the substance of God the Father, the generator of the universe and designer of things visible and invisible, things sensible and knowable – if it says that he in an ineffable manner transcending intellect assumed a likeness to us, and yet also remained God at the same time (for he is unchangeable by nature), what could appear altogether incredible or worthy of criticism or even out of reach in the doctrines we maintain?

[288] For a fuller explication of the claim that God persuades rather than coerces people to believe in Christ, see *c. Iul.* 6.45.

[289] In Greek, τὸ εὐήνιον, literally, "the quality of being obedient to the rein," from ἡνία ("rein"), which picks up on the equestrian imagery used in the last section.

[290] Cf. John 14:6.

[291] Gk.: ἀνθρωπολατρεία. On the distinction between worship of a human and the incarnation, see also *c. Iul.* 6.27 and for a discussion of this theme see Boulnois, SC 624, 114–20.

But of course, they say[292] the human body is insignificant and full of
[599] filth.[293] This is true and I will not deny it. Yet consider this: he came to be, as I said, "in the likeness of humans," as it is written,[294] and truly in a form like ours.[295] **8.49** Nevertheless, we hold that the one who is uncontainable was neither confined nor indeed was he encompassed by the body's limitation.[296] For it would be altogether silly and entirely senseless to say such a thing about the one who is truly God according to nature. For being the one and only Son, who is utterly beyond all corporeal imagery,[297] he is wholly everywhere and in everything through participation and in each individual in a relational sense, not by being divided up into parts or being cut up, but instead being, as God, outside of all things and in all things by nature. But in that all hallowed and holy body, which possessed a rational soul, "the fulness of the deity dwelt bodily," as it is written,[298] and he was in his own flesh, even though he was also filling all things while in this state. For just as the rays of the sun incur no damage when they strike stagnant water or some other foulness, so also the undefiled and inviolate nature, even if it should come into contact with bodies from earth, instead bestows a benefit upon them and it will not receive into itself an impres-
[600] sion from any of those things that naturally cause harm.[299]

Furthermore, it is, I think, appropriate for me to add the following. Our bodies are overcome by passions and easily fall into the love of

[292] The corresponding Syriac version of this passage has a singular verb here (ܐܡܪ) and attributes this objection explicitly to Julian, leading Christoph Riedweg to propose that the reading φασι ("they say") found in the Greek mss be emended to φησι ("he says") and that this passage be designated *c. Gal.* fr. 65a (Riedweg 2020a, 259–60). There are, however, indications in the surrounding context that Cyril has in mind not merely Julian but a wider group of Hellenes. See the plural references at *c. Iul.* 8.46.1 (οἱ δι' ἐναντίας) and 8.50.2–3 (παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήνων παισί). The present sentence seems in fact to be a restatement of the objection to human "flesh" and its "filth" present in 8.46.1–3, so the plural verb here is the most probable reading. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 586.

[293] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.48.23–49.11 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.100–08 (Boulnois 2020b, 177). Celsus raised similar objections about the pollution of the human body with respect to the doctrines of the resurrection and incarnation at Origen, *Cels.* 5.14; 6.73, and Porphyry referred to the "impurity arising from flesh and blood" in a passage Cyril will quote at *c. Iul.* 9.28; for criticism of Christ's "withdrawal" into a body, see also Porphyry (?), *Chr.* 83D Becker (= fr. 84 Harnack). Cf. *C. D.* 10.24; 10.28 where Augustine maintains that Porphyry despised the purification offered by Christ due to his fleshly incarnation.

[294] Phil 2:7. [295] *c. Iul.* 8.48.23–27 also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 868.

[296] On this theme, see Boulnois, SC 624, 120–29.

[297] For the notion of transcending corporeal imagery, see *c. Iul.* 8.19.6 (with note) and 8.25.6–7.

[298] Col 2:9.

[299] Boulnois has highlighted parallels between *c. Iul.* 8.49.11–15 and *Ep. Fest.* 15.3.72–83 (Boulnois 2020b, 177–78) and pointed out that these two passages are the only instances in his entire corpus in which Cyril uses the metaphor of the sun's rays to explain the incarnation; see Boulnois SC 624, 123–29 for discussion of Cyril's predecessors. The same metaphor is used in relation to the incarnation by Origen, *Cels.* 6.73; Eusebius, *D.e.* 4.13.1; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 4.27.11–13; Augustine, *C. D.* 9.16–18.

pleasure, and they are in fact sick with the law of sin in themselves. Yet we hold that in the divine and holy body of Christ there were no such disturbances, but the most inordinate of the passions were all entirely absent, and, since the body had come to be the property of the indwelling Word united to it, it was abounding in sanctification. For it was a holy temple of the one who sanctifies all the rest of creation.[300]

8.50 And I am astonished that among the children of the Greeks[301] there is a great admiration for the doctrines as well as the words of Porphyry and Julian,[302] yet they laugh at those of the Christians, in spite of the fact that they are pregnant with the truth in all that they contain. For, as we just said a moment ago, we ourselves believe that the only-begotten Word of God took on human form in order to save the realm under heaven. But Porphyry, in contrast, insists there is a certain race of gods who, he says, are also changed into humans at certain times, as if they are playing a game in which they live like we do.[303] Hence Julian – I do not know what he was thinking – says about Asclepius,

> *I had nearly forgotten the greatest of Helios' and Zeus's gifts. But with good reason I have saved it until the end. For it is not peculiar only to us [Romans], but is, I think, held in common with our kinsmen the Greeks. Indeed, Zeus* [601]
> *gave birth to Asclepius from himself in the intelligible realm, and revealed him to the earth through the life of nurturing Helios. Having advanced to earth from the sky, Asclepius at first appeared at Epidaurus singularly in the form of a human, but, multiplying himself from there in stages, he stretched out his saving right hand over all the earth.*[304]

Yet who doesn't know that, since Asclepius had perfected the science of medicine, this was the sole reason why he was admired by those who saw him, and that he did nothing that was astonishing? For which of Asclepius' deeds is worth hearing about? Or rather, who perished in such

[300] *c. Iul.* 8.49.1–23 was excerpted in *Flor. Cyrill.* 177 (185.17–186.16 Hespel) and also survives in Syriac. Cf. Kaufhold, GCS 21, 870–74.

[301] On the metaphor of "children," see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.4.5.

[302] The mention of Porphyry and Julian here together as a pair is unexpected because Porphyry has not figured prominently in this book of *c. Iul.*, aside from a single citation at 8.27 and a passing mention at 8.44. Perhaps Cyril is here giving us a glimpse of the regard with which these figures were held by his contemporaries.

[303] No surviving passage from Porphyry corresponds to this idea, so perhaps Cyril has in mind a lost work. His report combines elements found in Porphyry's corpus: those thought to be gods by the many are to be identified as mortals (fr. 469 Smith); the daemons often "play-act" and take on other forms like costumes or as entertainment for themselves (*Abst.* 2.40.3; *Ep. Aneb.* fr. 65u Saffrey and Segonds); there is a category of being that dissembles and takes on the forms of gods, daemons, or the spirits of the dead (*Ep. Aneb.* fr. 62 [= *c. Iul.* 4.14.7–15]; fr. 65j Saffrey and Segonds).

[304] *c. Gal.* fr. 46 Mas.; Wright 1923, 374–75. Cyril previously quoted this passage in a longer form at *c. Iul.* 6.22.

a miserable way as he did?! For he was burnt to ashes by a lightning bolt and indeed even lies as a corpse to the present day, while those who worship him don't even know where on earth he is.[305]

8.51 So even if someone like us did not point this out, the events themselves would cry aloud that Julian is lying when he says Asclepius came forth "*from heaven*" and "*stretched out*" "*his saving right hand upon all the earth*." For where are his deeds and what sort of memorial does he deserve? For his genealogy is in fact traced by the children of doctors[306] inasmuch as he was eminent in this craft, and they say that he was born from Coronis, a rather pitiful and insignificant woman.

So then, will Julian be allowed to fashion whatever myths he intends, and this with impunity, and go on record against us with nonsensical words, which are afflicted with a great turpitude, dressed up without any plausibility, and stripped of any proofs based on truth and accepted facts? And will he be allowed to treat as an excuse for running his mouth such a
[602] remarkable and truly venerable mystery that was spoken about beforehand through both the law and the holy prophets and was brought to its consummation when the only-begotten became human? If, then, the very consummation of the events did not confirm what was announced beforehand, they would have an understandable excuse for their unbelief. But if, on the contrary, one can see from the plausible [events] themselves that the ancient announcements made in advance all attained their consummation and that Israel slipped away from its relationship with God as Christ-killers,[307] while the multitude of the nations have been accepted through faith, I cannot imagine what could induce them to disbelieve. Or rather, as the divine Paul writes, "The god of this age" – that is, the one who is thought to be god in the present age – "has blinded the minds of unbelievers to prevent them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ,"[308] who shines in our hearts with the light of the knowledge of him, through whom and with whom be glory to God the Father with the Holy Spirit forever and ever. Amen.[309]

[305] Asclepius' death is also mentioned at *c. Iul.* 6.23.20–34; 7.26.9–11. Cyril's description of Asclepius as a "corpse" might be a deliberate echo of Julian's designation for Jesus as the "corpse of the Jews" at *c. Gal.* fr. 43 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.15.18–19).

[306] Gk.: τοῖς ἰατρῶν παισίν. On this use of παῖδες, see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.4.5.

[307] Gk.: κυριοκτόνος, literally "murders of the Lord."

[308] 2 Cor 4:4.

[309] Only books 5, 8, and 10 of *c. Iul.* conclude with a doxology. Books 5 and 10 do so presumably because they were the final books in a codex, since the treatise was originally arranged in pentads. A doxology concludes book 8 probably because of the doctrinal material it contains. Cf. Boulnois 2020b, 187.

Book 9

9.1 So then, by taking up our shield alongside the doctrines of the truth with the utmost endurance, so it seems to me, we have held our own against the nonsensical words of those who know only how to disparage our doctrines.[1] But because our opponent bears down upon the ineffable glory with all his sails unfurled and dares, as it were, to lead forth his profane ideas in unbearable assaults, expending his most effective resources on the task of stripping the nature of God the Father of his progeny and stripping the true Son, who came from his nature, of his *hypostasis*[2] (for he does away with his existence and engages in such extremely perilous undertakings), come now, "putting on the breastplate of justice," while also lifting up "the shield of faith" and whetting against him "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,"[3] let us show that he is a liar and in his extreme arrogance all but kicks against the goads[4] and leaps down into the deep pit of destruction.[5] [603] [604]

As I said, we have already woven together a valiant tapestry of words against him and have plainly shown that coexisting with the Father and ever subsisting along with him is the Word who is from him with respect to his nature and is in him in terms of a union and an identity of essence, the one through whom all things were brought into existence. Yet because Julian has also devised another insipid and impotent argument – though in his view it is a terrifyingly clever denunciation, a denunciation, that is, of the only-begotten – we have no choice but once again to oppose vigorously what he has attempted to say and thereby rein in the raging onslaught of his endless banter against Christ. For once more he writes as follows:

[1] The "doctrines" (δόγματα) Cyril has in mind are belief in the Son's eternal existence and his incarnation, discussed in the previous book.
[2] Gk.: ἀνυπόστατον. [3] Cf. Eph 6:14–17. [4] Cf. Acts 26:14.
[5] Masaracchia included the second sentence of this paragraph (from "But because our opponent" to the end of the paragraph) as *c. Gal.* fr. 66. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 420 n. 1.

Julian

9.2 *And hear from his own words that Moses calls the angels "gods": "Now when the sons of God saw the daughters of humans, that they are beautiful, they took wives for themselves of all that they chose."*[6] *And a little later: "And after that, when the sons of God used to go in to the daughters of humans, they produced offspring for themselves, and these were the giants from of old who were renowned."*[7] *Now the fact that he is talking about angels is obvious and does not rely on a variant noted in the margin,*[8] *but is also clear from his statement that it was not humans but giants who came from them. For it is clear that if he had thought their fathers were humans rather than beings of some superior and more powerful nature, he would not have said the giants were*
[605] *begotten from them. For it seems to me that he has declared that the race of the giants began from a mixing of the mortal with the immortal.*[9]

Wouldn't he who refers by name to many "sons of God" – and these are not humans but angels – wouldn't he have informed humanity about "God the only-begotten Word," or "the Son of God," or whatever you call him, if in fact he had known about him? And because he regarded doing so as a trifling matter, he says about Israel, "Israel is my firstborn son."[10] *So why did Moses not also say these things about Jesus? He used to teach that there is only one God and that there are many sons of God who have divided the nations among themselves.*[11] *But the "firstborn Son" or "God the Word" or any of those things falsely concocted later by you he neither knew in the first place nor did he ever teach openly.*[12]

[6] Gen 6:2. [7] Gen 6:4.

[8] The Greek for "and does not rely on a variant noted in the margin" is καί ἔξωθεν οὐ προσπαρακείμενον (literally, "and not something attached externally"). We follow the argument of Boulnois 2021 in seeing the phrase as a reference to a variant reading noted in the margin of Julian's copy of Genesis, as Cyril himself also seems to understand it in his later comment on this line (*c. Iul.* 9.11.24–29). Julian's point is that even though the main text reads "sons of God," a marginal note provides the variant reading "angels." Nevertheless, one does not even have to rely on the variant to recognize that Moses is talking about angels because it is clear enough from the text without it. Some LXX mss do in fact have as their main text οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ in place of οἱ υἱοί τοῦ θεοῦ. Others, as noted by Boulnois, have υἱοί in their main text and marginal notes explaining that the text is referring to ἄγγελοι, which is similar to the form of the text Julian apparently had at his disposal. The version having οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ was also mentioned by Philo, *Gig.* 6.1; Eusebius, *Is.* 1.65.56; *P.e.* 5.4.9; Didymus, *Gen.* 6:2 (SC 244.22). This is not the only instance in which Julian astutely highlighted the textual diversity evident in the church's canonical texts; cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 62 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2).

[9] In his treatise against Manichaeism, the Platonist author Alexander of Lycopolis similarly compared the story in Genesis 6 to poetic allegories about giants (*Man.* 25; on which see Edwards 2015, 140).

[10] Exod 4:22.

[11] On the idea that the nations are assigned to specific gods in the divine pantheon, see especially Julian, *c. Gal.* frs. 21–28 Mas., cited and responded to in *c. Iul.* book 4, and especially *c. Gal.* fr. 27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.43), where Julian argues that Moses' account of the Tower of Babel episode assumes the existence of a plurality of gods.

[12] Celsus had also argued that Christian devotion to Jesus was a violation of monotheism (see Origen, *Cels.* 8.12). The anonymous Hellene in Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.3.3.2 similarly argued that Moses never refers to the Christ as "God" or "God the Word."

> *Listen to Moses himself and the other prophets. Moses frequently says many such things as this: "You shall fear the Lord your God and serve him alone."*[13] *Why, then, is it reported in the gospels that Jesus commands, "Go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,"*[14] *assuming that would have meant them serving him too?*[15] *And you yourselves also, as you reflect upon the implications of these words, speak of the Son as God along with the Father.*[16] [606]

Cyril

9.3 So then, Julian is on the hunt and is making a serious effort to appear well-educated and to assemble true and thoroughly researched information about our doctrines. Nevertheless, we will, without any effort, reveal that here as well he is in no small measure uneducated and is ignorant of the deeper meaning in the sacred writings. Now his aim[17] is, as I said,[18] to prove that there are many gods. But he apparently thinks the tactic that would best advance his cause, and something he could reasonably hope to achieve, would be to prove with the utmost clarity that the all-wise Moses refers to God as "one" and "only," while having hardly anything at all to say about the Son along with him. Indeed, the whole aim[19] of Julian's perversity is bent upon this one thing. Now over the course of the long discourse we have already brought forward, it has been shown that the Son also subsists together with God the Father and that [the Father] could never be thought of apart from his own Word. Nevertheless, the task now at hand is to prove the same thing on the basis of what Moses himself said.

[13] Deut 6:13. [14] Matt 28:19.

[15] The GCS edition places the αὐτῷ ("him") in the final clause of this sentence in quotation marks, indicating it as an allusion to the Deuteronomy passage just cited, in which case the "him" is God. The line is admittedly somewhat obscure and editors have attempted various emendations. Gollwitzer added μή, which would make the final clause a contrast with the baptismal command (i.e., they could not "serve the one God" in light of the dominical order), while Masaracchia added μόνῷ ("alone") to make the reference to the Deuteronomy passage more explicit. However, the sentence as it stands becomes clearer if the αὐτῷ is taken as a reference to Jesus rather than to the God of Moses. That is, serving Jesus "too" (καί) would require the disciples to violate Moses' command.

[16] *c. Gal.* fr. 67 Mas.; Wright 1923, 400–03. [17] Gk.: σκοπός.

[18] It is usually the case that the intended referents of Cyril's parenthetical "as I said" remarks are unambiguous, but in this instance it is unclear since in fact he has not yet said any such thing in the present book. Perhaps, as the apparatus of the GCS edition suggests, he is referring back to Julian's own words in the first paragraph of the fragment he has just cited. Alternatively, he could be referring to something he had said much earlier, e.g., *c. Iul.* 3.38.5–10 (where he had stated that Julian's aim was to mix the God of the Hebrews up with the "welter of other gods") or 8.22.10–12 (where Julian's aim is described as destroying the Son's existence, a point reiterated at 9.1 above).

[19] Gk.: σκοπός.

For Julian insists that Moses made absolutely no mention of the Word and that he was unaware of the Son who coexists with God the Father, but
[607] instead has mentioned many other gods or, in his own words, "*city-guarding*" angels who have divided the nations among themselves.[20]

9.4 So then, Your Excellency, when you hear the sacred writings naming as "gods" some of those beings belonging to the class of created things, you ought to realize that the one who is true God by nature has honored the entire rational creation with such an appellation. For example, the divine Paul says that he is aware that though there are "many" who are called "gods and lords," both "in heaven and on earth,"[21] none of them are such in actual fact except one – he who is by nature God the Father over all and with him his own inseparable Word innate to him and coexistent with him, who we say is also named the "firstborn of all creation,"[22] since he has taken up the rational creation into a kinship with himself, a kinship understood as a gift, based on their being made "according to his likeness and image."[23] Therefore, not only angels, but even we ourselves are styled "gods" and "sons," due to our status as images of the one who is truly God and Son.[24] "For," he says, "I said, 'You are gods and are all sons of the Most High.'"[25] Therefore, even if the title of sonship has been bestowed upon some of those beings brought into existence, still there is only one who is truly God by nature and we have been molded according to his form, thereby gaining from him such
[608] a renowned and most eminent title as a gift.

9.5 I will now attempt to demonstrate that Moses knew that God the heavenly Father is not without progeny and in fact "*frequently*" also makes mention of the Word who came forth from him and addresses him with various names, as do also the holy prophets who came after him.[26] Hence, he understood that the Word is the image of God the Father and, as the most holy Paul says, "the imprint of his *hypostasis*."[27] For he has written clearly in the book of Genesis, "And God made humanity; according to the image of God he made it."[28] Do you hear in this passage how exceedingly well he has actually said that God crafted humanity according to the image of God? For we have been molded, as I

[20] Julian speaks of "city-guarding gods" at *c. Gal.* fr. 21.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.12). [21] 1 Cor 8:5.
[22] Col 1:15. [23] Cf. Gen 1:26.
[24] On the topic of angels bearing the image of God, see Boulnois, SC 624, 598–600, who observes that Cyril makes the same point in *Resp.* 14.
[25] Ps 81(82):6.
[26] Boulnois (SC 624, 437 n. 2) has pointed out that most of the passages cited by Cyril in *c. Iul.* 9.5–7 also appear in a florilegium of biblical texts in his *Thes.* XXXV (PG 75.617–56).
[27] Heb 1:3. [28] Gen 1:27.

said, according to the form of the Son, while the Spirit, through sanctification, stamps us with a godlike and preeminent beauty, in an intellectual and spiritual manner, that is. And anyone could see that the Son is the image and likeness of God the Father through the statement he himself makes at one point: "And everyone who spills a person's blood will have his own blood spilled in return for this blood, since I made humanity in God's image."[29] For the one who dares to commit murder would, since he insults the divine image, understandably have to pay a just penalty that was equivalent to the offense.

9.6 Furthermore, from the Father's own voice in the following passage you can recognize that Moses also understood that he is named "Word." For Israel was living in the wilderness, delighting in the provision of [609]
manna, but when a desire for the meat of Egypt came upon them, they cried out against the most excellent Moses, and he drew near to God saying, "Where can I get meat to give to this people for them to eat?"[30] And when God promised to provide this too and in fact said it would suffice, even so Moses was still disheartened. Then the God of the universe said to him, "Will the Lord's hand not be sufficient? Now you shall know whether my Word will overtake you or not."[31] For the entirety of the Father's activity is, as I said,[32] mediated by him. It is for this reason that he is named his "power" and "right hand" and "arm." For example, Moses mentioned that God said in Deuteronomy, "I will lift up my hand unto heaven and I will swear by my right hand."[33] For in this passage he says the Son through whom are all things and in whom are all things is his hand and indeed also his right hand. Moreover, he will confirm that the Son who is both from him and in him with respect to his nature is not another alongside him, for he says once more in another place, "I have sworn by myself, says the Lord."[34] For in swearing by his own right hand, which is the Son, he doubtless swears by himself. For nothing at all intervenes – I mean insofar as it concerns the natural unity and identity understood with respect to the two of them – besides the sole fact that one of them is Father and has begotten, while the other has appeared [610]
from him in the manner of begetting[35] and is co-eternal with him, since

[29] Gen 9:6. Cyril similarly uses this passage to defend the Son's deity at *Jo*. 5:23 (1.337.18–338.8 Pusey); *Thes*. XXXV (PG 75.641).
[30] Num 11:13.
[31] Num 11:23. This passage was also cited as a reference to the divine Word by Justin, *Dial*. 126.6.
[32] Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.31.35–36; 8.32.14–16. [33] Deut 32:40. [34] Gen 22:16.
[35] *c. Iul.* 9.6.16–23 was excerpted and included in the catena tradition on Hebrews, joined to a passage from *c. Iul.* 5.15.11–16. Cf. Cramer 1844, VII: 512.5–11.

the Father is eternally Father and was not brought to this condition at some point in time.

9.7 The divine David also understood that the Son is the right hand of the Father, saying, "The Lord's right hand has acted in power, the Lord's right hand lifted me up."[36] And indeed also Moses himself [said], "Your right hand, O Lord, has been glorified in strength. Your right hand, O Lord, shattered your enemies."[37] And once more, "May fear and trembling fall upon them; by the greatness of your arm let them be turned to stone, until your people should pass by, O Lord."[38] And he has called out at one point among the peoples of the Jews, "For as the Lord our God did to the Red Sea, which the Lord our God dried up until we went across, so that all the nations of the earth may know that the power of the Lord is mighty."[39] And indeed also another of the holy prophets says to the Father in the heavens, "Be exalted, O Lord, in your power."[40] For he is glorified in the Son. And again, "Command, O God, by your power; make powerful, O God, that which you have done
[611] among us."[41] For we are made powerful in the Son. And indeed also the Son himself commanded the holy apostles not to depart from Jerusalem until they were "clothed with power from on high."[42] And once again Paul will clarify what this "power from on high" should be understood to be when he says, "Clothe yourselves with our Lord Jesus Christ."[43] And I once more hear Moses writing the following: "You shall not fear other gods and you shall not worship them and you shall not serve them any longer, but only the Lord who led you up from the land of Egypt by his great might and by his uplifted arm."[44] The divine David thought and spoke in agreement with what Moses said, since he sings in a psalm, "He sent forth his Word and healed them."[45] Therefore, it was by the divine Word that ancient Israel was redeemed and set free from maladies of the soul.

9.8 Furthermore, anyone ought to be able to recognize, based upon what has been written in Exodus, that Moses calls the Son by the name "Lord" too, in full awareness of the fact that the Father himself also exists as Lord. For it reads as follows, "And Moses, rising early, went up to Mount Sinai, just as the Lord commanded him. And Moses took with him the stone tablets. And the Lord descended in a cloud and stood

[36] Ps 117(118):15b–16a. [37] Exod 15:6. [38] Exod 15:16. [39] Josh 4:23b–24a. [40] Ps 20(21):14a.
[41] Ps 67(68):29. [42] Luke 24:49. [43] Rom 13:14.
[44] 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 17:35b–36a. Cyril incorrectly attributes this passage to Moses when in fact it is a statement made by God himself and does not come from the Pentateuch.
[45] Ps 106(107):20a.

beside him there and he spoke by the name of the Lord and the Lord passed by from the face of the Lord."[46] [612]

So then, which Lord is it that spoke in the name of the Lord and which Lord is it that passed by from the face of the Lord? Or is it not clear that we will doubtless believe the Father appeared and spoke in the Son? Are there then two Lords, existing separately, as one would understand two humans to be? Certainly not. For there is a single lordship and divinity belonging to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, although each of those named is understood in a *hypostasis* unique to it. The sacred writing everywhere reveals the properties and select features of the single nature, while also teaching that they adhere to each of them perfectly. The Son, for example, since he possesses in himself the entire set of the Father's natural properties[47] and also exists in the Father together with those properties the Father is understood to have, clearly says to the Father, "All that is mine is yours and yours is mine." And once more, "All that the Father has is the Son's."[48]

9.9 Therefore, if the all-wise Moses points to the Son in so many passages and not just in one way, [Julian] should refrain from saying, "*Wouldn't he who refers by name to many 'sons of God' – and these are not humans but angels – wouldn't he have informed humanity about 'God the only-begotten Word,' or 'the Son of God,' or whatever you call him, if in fact he had known about him?*"[49] He has pointed it out, O wise man, and with exceptional frequency and clarity! Yet you yourself hardly understand it, although he has written it down, and quite rightly so: "You shall worship the Lord your God and serve him alone,"[50] and all the other passages that agree with this one. [613]

Next, supposing that such things were said for the purpose of abolishing the Son rather than overthrowing your gods,[51] you were not afraid to say, "*Moses, therefore,* in many places *says many such things as this: 'You shall fear the Lord your God and serve him alone.'*[52] *Why, then, is it reported*

[46] Exod 34:4–5. Cyril's version of this passage reads ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου ("from the face of the Lord"), while the LXX has ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ("from his face"), with Moses presumably being the referent of the pronoun rather than the Lord. Cyril's version is also cited in Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 1.7 Albl (PG 46.200c), who follows it with the same two questions that Cyril asks immediately after the quotation. On the relation of these two texts, see the note at *c. Iul.* 8.11.

[47] Gk.: ὅλην … τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἰδιότητα φυσικήν. For discussion of the natural properties shared by the persons of the Trinity, see Boulnois 1994, 316–19.

[48] John 17:10; 16:15. Cf. *Thes.* IX (PG 75.117a), with Boulnois 1994, 317 (and n. 17).

[49] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 67.17–20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.2.15–18). [50] Deut 6:13.

[51] On the notion that Moses' insistence on worship of a single God was intended to oppose (Greek) polytheism, cf. *c. Iul.* 8.24.1–12.

[52] Deut 6:13.

in the gospels that Jesus commands, 'Go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit'?'"[53] Accordingly you yourself will learn from us the answer to this question too. If Moses and the prophets confessed the holy and consubstantial Trinity and your own elite ranks were not ignorant of it, how, pray tell, can you not recognize that you are suffering from an intractable and stubborn arrogance? For they themselves also grant the existence of three principal *hypostases*, though they separate them from one another and arrange them in a descending hierarchy.[54] For they were apparently unaware of the pure account of God, though they were not entirely devoid of a pretense of fastening upon the truth.

Nevertheless, I once again perceive that some of those who have a mindset identical to Julian's will probably have a response to this argument as well, saying, "Yes, dear sir, Moses has given the Son the names 'word' and indeed also 'power' and 'arm' and 'right hand of the Father,' but he knew nothing of the manner of the incarnation." **9.10** Observe, therefore, yes observe that that all-wise man has written truly about these very things too in the following account. For he said Jacob departed from Laban's home and longed for the country that bore him. But when he came to the
[614] Jabok (and this means "a swollen river"), [Moses] says he led his children across, but "Jacob was left alone and a man was wrestling with him until morning."[55] And further on, "Jacob asked him and said, 'Tell me your name.' And he said, 'Why do you ask this, my name?' And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of that place Form of God. 'For I have seen God face-to-face, and my soul was saved.'"[56] The divine Moses added, "And the sun rose upon him, when he passed by Form of God."[57]

O what a great marvel, what a pure mind, what a well-refined intellect[58] that subtly understands the import of the mystery concerning Christ! Though "a man" was wrestling with him face to face, he says he has seen "God" and he gives him the name "Form of God." For the Word truly was and is God, even if he became flesh according to the scriptures. Moreover, he has also remained the "imprint of the *hypostasis*" of the Father, although he has put on the "form of a servant"[59] for the sake of

[53] Matt 28:19. Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 67 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.2.24–29).

[54] For Cyril's argument that the Greeks had a notion of the Trinity, see *c. Iul.* 1.35–49; 8.26–33. Significantly, in the latter section of text, Plotinus' essay entitled "On the Three Principal Hypostases" (5.1) – a title already noted by Cyril at *c. Iul.* 2.46.19–20 – is quoted several times.

[55] Gen 32:24. [56] Gen 32:29–30. [57] Gen 32:31.

[58] Gk.: κατερρινημένου (literally, "filed down"); cf. *c. Iul.* 1.25.2, where we translated it as "concepts … filed down to an elegant polish."

[59] Cf. Heb 1:3; Phil 2:7.

the economy;[60] for he is unchangeable and immutable in terms of his nature. From what Moses has written anyone ought to be able to see without any difficulty at all that the man wrestling with Jacob is the only-begotten Word of God, who is indicating in advance to the holy fathers that at the appropriate time he will exist in a form like us. For [Moses] said, "And the Lord said to Jacob, 'Arise and go to the place of Bethel and dwell there and make there an altar for the Lord who appeared to you when you were running away from the face of Esau your brother.'"[61] In light of this passage, will anyone then still say Moses was unaware of the manner of the only-begotten's incarnation? [615]

9.11 Furthermore, since His Excellency Julian has also mentioned angels and says they have descended into such a lack of self-control that they – I cannot fathom how – leaped upon the beauty of women and were fearfully ensnared by bodily desires for pleasures contrary to their nature, come and let us show that also with this claim he has entirely missed the point.[62] Now I know that we have taken up an argument that is tangential, but, since the story has already been introduced into the discussion, there is no harm in us submitting a plea on behalf of the nature of the holy angels, since even it has been slandered by Julian, especially since it would negatively affect our listeners if one were to say that even the holy angels themselves melted at the sight of bodily beauty, or rather that they were thrilled with such profane and inordinate pleasures. Otherwise, if we are to believe that even the holy angels themselves have been made abjectly subservient to passion, is it not likely that many people will then give up and, disregarding the better option, choose hedonism instead, once they realize the longing to resist the movements of the flesh will most certainly be a difficult burden and an uphill climb for them?[63] [616]

[60] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς.

[61] Gen 35:1. The mention in the passage at hand of Jacob's flight from his brother Esau is an allusion to the aforementioned episode of the night-time wrestling found in Genesis 32. On Cyril's exegesis of this episode in his other works, see Boulnois, SC 624, 444 n. 1.

[62] Masaracchia included this sentence as *c. Gal.* fr. 68 in her edition, though it seems to be merely Cyril's restatement of fr. 67, quoted above in *c. Iul.* 9.2, since he has thus far not responded to the first half of fr. 67 about the origin of the giants. Having adequately dealt with the latter portion of fr. 67 about Moses' ignorance of the Son's existence and incarnation, he now seems to be turning back to deal with the first part of it. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 446 n. 2. For the claim that Julian misses the mark or fails in his aim (σκοπός), see *c. Iul.* 2.35.4 with note.

[63] As highlighted by Boulnois (SC 624, 448 n. 1), Theodoret, perhaps following Cyril's lead, likewise remarked upon the negative ethical implications of viewing the angels as susceptible to illicit desire (*Qu. in Gen.* 47.1). See also *c. Iul.* 3.28, where Cyril discusses the kind of knowledge of good and evil held by "intellectual" and incorporeal beings like angels. At *C. D.* 15.23, Augustine remained agnostic about whether spirits with ethereal bodies can experience desire and have intercourse with humans, though he insisted that this could never be true for angels.

Hence, we shall show without any difficulty that Julian is ignorant of the meaning of this text. For the divine Moses has written for us, "And it came about when human beings began to become numerous on the earth, that daughters were also born to them. Now when the sons of God saw the daughters of humans, that they are beautiful, they took wives for themselves of all that they chose."[64] And indeed they also gave birth, he says, to the giants.[65] Julian, however, confidently maintained that "the *angels* of God" is an additional reading "*in the margin*," despite the fact that the more accurate version of the scripture in the center [of the page] reads "the sons of God."[66] Moreover, it should be noted that after the publication of the Seventy's translation, when the others came to translate the same passage, they said "the sons of the rulers" in place of "the sons of God."[67]

9.12 I will, therefore, attempt to provide a good explanation of what the aim[68] of this passage is. For two sons were born to Adam – Cain and Abel – but Abel, having fallen prey to Cain's madness, departed from our present condition while still childless, since he was murdered, as the sacred writings would have us believe. The race of Cain, however,

[64] Gen 6:1–2. [65] See Gen 6:4.

[66] In *c. Gal.* fr. 67 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.2.7–8) Julian argued that one need not turn to "a variant noted in the margin" (ἔξωθεν οὐ προσπαρακείμενον) to see that Moses has angels in view, and Cyril here alludes to that sentence by saying Julian maintains that the phrase οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ "is an additional reading in the margin" (ἔξωθέν … προσγεγράφθαι). For further discussion, see the note above at *c. Iul.* 9.2. Cyril uses similar language to refer to a marginal textual variant in *c. Iul.* fr. 16.10–11. Here he describes the reading οἱ υἱοί τοῦ θεοῦ as the "more accurate" (ἀληθεστέρας) version which is "in the center [of the page]" (ἐν μέσῳ). The latter phrase seems to be in contrast to ἔξωθεν, which refers to the margin, so we take it to refer to the main text in the center of the page, following Boulnois 2021. Again, as highlighted by Boulnois 2021, Cyril at *Resp.* 15 refers to "some copies" (τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων) that include the reading οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ "as a paratext placed in the margin" (παρεγγραφὴ δε ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τιθεμένη), the same textual configuration that he and Julian allude to here. The variation in this passage in the Greek translations of Genesis was also noted by Augustine, *C. D.* 15.23.

[67] Cyril's mention of "the others" in the plural is a reference to the three Greek recensions of the Hebrew scriptures included in Origen's Hexapla alongside the LXX – Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. However, only Symmachus has the alternative reading οἱ υἱοί τῶν δυναστευόντων which Cyril refers to; Aquila has οἱ υἱοί τῶν θεῶν while Theodotion has υἱοί τοῦ θεοῦ. Hence, either Cyril is providing a general reference without attempting to be precise, or this report on the readings of "the others" has been garbled by Cyril or by his source. In support of the former interpretation is the fact that at *Glaph. Gen.* 2 (PG 69.53cd) he also reports on the variations of this phrase in "the other translators" and accurately cites the renderings of Aquila and Symmachus mentioning both by name. Furthermore, at *Resp.* 15, Cyril once again provides a general reference to the variant translations of the phrase, mentioning Symmachus' rendering without naming him specifically, along with the otherwise unattested version οἱ υἱοί τῶν δυναστῶν. It seems most likely that in the present context Cyril has not bothered with giving a full accounting of the diverse textual evidence but simply reported the one version that best serves his purpose.

[68] Gk.: σκοπός.

extended even as far as Lamech, who was a murderer. For he confesses, "I have killed a man for wounding me and a young man for bruising me."[69] Eve then gave birth to Seth from whom came Enosh, about whom it has been written, "He hoped to receive the surname 'the Lord God.'"[70] For since he attained the full measure of all good deeds and so understandably became something of a marvel, he was honored by his contemporaries with the appellation "God";[71] for he is named "God," since he was assigned to be steward of all justice and virtue. Now the race of people descended from him extended even as far as the days of Noah, who was "a just man"; for he "was well pleasing to God," as it has been written about him.[72] Therefore, the race that came forth from Cain, following the habits of its ancestor, practiced an unholy and abominable way of life, yet those from Enosh who was surnamed "God," walking in the footsteps of their ancestral virtue even as far as Noah, were manifestly good and just and in possession of all other such things. Now the races were unmixed with one another, and the clean, who in fact used also to be called "sons of God," used to hold themselves aloof from the profane. For, as I said, they maintained the bloodline of Enosh who was surnamed "God"[73] into the days of Noah. [617] [618]

"The sons of God" – that is, those from the bloodline of Enosh – having seen "the daughters of humans" – that is, daughters from the bloodline of Cain and those after him – "that they are beautiful, took wives for themselves of all that they chose."[74] Hence, when the races had

[69] Gen 4:23.

[70] Gen 4:26. Our translation of this verse takes the ambiguous verbal form ἐπικαλεῖσθαι as a passive ("to be surnamed") rather than a middle ("to invoke") as it is usually understood, since Cyril's ensuing interpretation clearly views it as a passive.

[71] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.19.19–23 where Cyril makes a similar point about Moses.

[72] Gen 6:9.

[73] Cyril gives the same interpretation of the enigmatic "sons of God" in Gen 6:2 in *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69.48ab); *Resp.* 15. Other ancient authors also passed on this exegetical tradition. For example, Eusebius of Emesa mentioned it in his *Commentary on Genesis* and proposed that it was the correct understanding of the Hebrew text, which, he claimed, was better translated ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ in place of the LXX reading ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (*Gen.* fr. 16). The dative following the infinitive makes it more difficult to read the verb as a middle ("to invoke") and almost requires that it be read as a passive ("to be surnamed"). Both the Greek fragment and the relevant Armenian passage of Eusebius' commentary are printed, with English translation, in R. B. ter Haar Romeny 1997, 242–48. Procopius of Gaza later included this passage from Eusebius in his own *Commentary on Genesis*: *Gen.* 4:26, lines 2–8 Metzler. See also Julius Africanus, *Chron.* fr. 19; 23 (44–45; 48–49 Wallraff); John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Gen.* 20.15; 21.9; 22.8 (PG 53.172; 178; 189); Theodoret, *Qu. in Gen.* 47.2–3. This interpretation is probably also what Didymus the Blind has in mind at *Gen.* 4:26 (SC 233.332). Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 600–02. Though without this precise exegetical argument, Augustine also maintained that the "sons of God" mentioned in Genesis were humans (*C. D.* 15.22–23).

[74] Gen 6:2.

come together with one another and when the good race had been utterly destroyed through intercourse with the worse one, and when justice and well-being no longer existed among those dwelling upon the earth, the God of the universe let loose the flood, ordaining a single sentence of death for all with no distinction. For he, with holiness, weighs our affairs on his scales, and regards impiety as unbearable. Moreover, the women, he says, were giving birth to giants, meaning that the divine wrath ultimately debased even the very beauty of their bodies since they had trampled upon justice for the sake of base passions and the
[619] most abominable pleasure. So while the giants were most likely stocky and most brazen men, they were deformed with an extremely horrible appearance. And it is customary for the God-breathed scripture to call those with a savage mind and an exceptionally stout constitution "giants." For example, the God of the universe said about the Persians and the Medes who were about to take Judea captive, "Giants are coming to fulfil my wrath, rejoicing and reviling at the same time."[75] For in fact we ourselves do not maintain, as do the Greeks' poets, that the giants were supremely large and lifted up so high in terms of their bodies that they even seized islands from the midst of the sea and threw them up into heaven;[76] rather they were ugly in appearance and monstrous and impetuous, though not as far beyond the limits of humanity as the elite ranks of the Greeks thought it right to say in their lying tales.[77] So enough of this indictment of the holy angels, as well as the blame and accusations against them about base pleasures.

9.13 Now as for the fact that we are not at odds with the doctrines of the all-wise Moses but have adopted a view on all matters that corresponds with them and, as it were, fits together exceptionally well with them, this is something an earlier argument of ours has demonstrated clearly and sufficiently.[78] Nevertheless, Julian imagines he can prove that
[620] we in no way agree with Moses or even try to reflect his ideas, though in fact he has spoken pointless nonsense, pouring out upon us so very many words. For indeed he says that the Christian tradition[79] does not agree

[75] Isa 13:3.

[76] The GCS apparatus suggests that Cyril might be alluding to the Greek Gigantomachia attributed to the poet Claudian, of which only a few fragments survive; see Koch 1893, 311–13. Cf. Cyril's interpretation of the Homeric giants at *c. Iul.* 4.32.12–26.

[77] Cf. the interpretation of the giants given by Theodoret, who affirmed their unusually large size (*Qu. in Gen.* 48).

[78] Cyril's use here of the word λόγος lacks a definite article ("an argument") but is probably an allusion to the previous book of *c. Iul.* Cf. the opening sentence of book 9, which also refers to "doctrines."

[79] Greek: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

with Moses' laws, nor do Christians think it worthwhile to live according to the customs of the Jews, although the [customs] among the Greeks harmonize with those of the Jews. For they too, he says, use laws and customs that are no different from the Greeks' but rather are the same, with the exception of maybe two or at most three points – the fact that they do not recognize other gods or the form of sacrifice they call "soothsaying"[80] – since he contends that all other practices are common to both and indistinguishable. For, he says, while circumcision is most important among the Jews, the more holy of the temple-wardens in Egypt, in addition to the Chaldeans and Saracens, do not deem it unacceptable.[81] Furthermore, "*the sacrificial methods*"[82] as well, he says, are equally respected by both, such as firstfruits, whole burnt offerings, vows, thank offerings, and, as he sees it, honorary offerings, as well as also purifications for faults committed in ignorance.[83]

For, having selected from Moses' writings the names of sacrifices, Julian then incorporates them into his own explanations,[84] presumably so that nothing in our tradition might seem to be left uninspected[85] by [621] him.[86] For he above all longs to be thought of as someone who appears wise and he is desperately hunting for a reputation for being erudite. But he is apparently ignorant of the fact that, while it is not difficult to be acquainted with the *letter* of the law, the import of the concepts within it is entirely inaccessible to him or those like him. For example, God at one point said through one of the holy prophets, "Who will be wise and understand these things, or intelligent and comprehend them? For the

[80] Gk.: ἡπατοσκοπικῆς, literally divination by "inspecting the liver" of the sacrificial victim; cf. *c. Iul.* 6.20.21.

[81] On other nations practicing circumcision, see Herodotus 2.104; Origen, *Cels*. 5.41; Epiphanius, *Haer*. 33.3.

[82] Gk.: τῶν θυσιῶν τοὺς τρόπους, which could also be translated "the types/kinds of sacrifices." So also, at *c. Iul.* 9.14.3 and *c. Gal.* 71.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.11).

[83] On this list, see Boulnois, SC 624, 458 n. 2, 603–05.

[84] Gk.: τοῖς ἰδίοις … λόγοις, so it might also be "his own words," which would be in keeping with Cyril's focus in what follows on Julian's use of the nonbiblical term ἀποτρόπαιος.

[85] Gk.: ἀπολυπραγμόνητον; Cyril may intend this term in an ironic manner, since Julian had requested Christian respondents not to be "busybodies" over the details of pagan literature or religion (see *c. Gal.* fr. 2.6 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.7.4 with note]).

[86] The preceding section beginning with "Nevertheless, Julian imagines he can prove" and extending to this point (= *c. Iul.* 9.13.4–23) was included in Masaracchia's edition as *c. Gal.* fr. 69. Although they do not correspond exactly to any of the surviving portions of *c. Gal.*, Cyril is reflecting Julianic language, as, for example, with the word τιμητήριος ("honoring"), which is otherwise found only in Julian's writings (*ad deor. matr.* 17.176d–177a [x3]). The phrase "sacrificial methods" (τῶν θυσιῶν τοὺς τρόπους) is also found in *c. Gal.* fr. 71.2–3 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.11). Finally, the word ὁλοκαυτισμοὺς ("whole burnt offering") is a hapax legomenon, aside from its entry in Photius' *Lexicon*, and is perhaps also a word Cyril is repeating from a lost portion of Julian's *c. Gal.*

ways of the Lord are straight and the just will walk in them, but the impious will falter in them."[87] Therefore, even if Julian adduces for us many passages from the God-breathed scripture, he ought nevertheless to know that he understands nothing. For example, he supposed that the hierophant Moses performed sacrifices to polluted and abominable[88] daemons and – what is even more unbearable – Julian said the lawgiver himself[89] permitted [Moses] to do this, so that we might catch him contradicting himself with regard to the laws he gives. For [Moses] said, "The one who sacrifices to other gods aside from the Lord alone shall be utterly destroyed."[90] Yet if, as Julian says, [Moses] is seen commanding
[622] them to make customary dedications to abominable[91] daemons, how could [Moses] manage to divert us from this evil when in fact he himself is clearly setting us on the path that leads to it?

9.14 So we must observe what sort of slanderous attack on God Julian once again has made. For, as he was enumerating[92] "*the sacrificial methods*,"[93] he said,[94]

[87] Hos 14:10.

[88] Greek: ἀποτροπαίοις. Cyril anticipates Julian's use of this term at *c. Gal.* fr. 70.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.14.5), and his subsequent engagement with his opponent in *c. Iul.* 9.15–20 is aimed at refuting Julian's claim that the ritual prescribed in Lev 16 is an apotropaic sacrifice. See also *c. Iul.* 4.20–23, where Cyril argues with a hypothetical Hellenic opponent on the issue of apotropaic sacrifices. In that earlier passage in book 4, Cyril may have had in mind *c. Gal.* fr. 70 Mas., which he is now about to quote and respond to at length. This adjective could have either an active or a passive sense, i.e., either "averting evil" or, conversely, "evil that ought to be avoided," i.e., "abominable" (so LSJ, s.v. ἀποτρόπαιος; Lampe, PGL, s.v. ἀποτρόπαιος). On this issue, see our note at *c. Iul.* 4.21 and Boulnois, SC 624, 460 n. 2. In his discussion at *c. Iul.* 4.21–23, Cyril clearly understands the term to mean "beings who must be averted," so we have translated it similarly here, though it is possible, as Boulnois observes, that Cyril is following Julian in this instance and viewing the term in its technical, active sense.

[89] Presumably the "lawgiver" (νομοθέτην) here is God.

[90] Exod 22:19(20).

[91] Gk.: ἀποτροπαίοις.

[92] The mss here read ἀναμετρῆσαι, an infinitive used in indirect discourse following ἔφη, but Neumann conjectured the participle ἀναμετρήσας, following Oecolampadius' *commemorans*. The GCS apparatus comments that the emendation is "possibly correct," and this is the reading we adopt here.

[93] Gk.: τοὺς τῶν θυσιῶν … τρόπους.

[94] On the exegetical debate that follows in *c. Iul.* 9.14–20, see Guinot 1988; Riedweg 2012, 439–76; Boulnois 2020b, 180–81; Boswell 2021. Cyril also dealt extensively with this passage of Leviticus in his *Ep.* 41, which he wrote at the request of Acacius of Scythopolis in 432. In addition, he provided a more abbreviated discussion of it in *Glaph. Lev.* (PG 69.585c–89b). In both his treatment of the passage in *Ep.* 41 and *Glaph. Lev.*, Cyril mentions that some people maintain the biblical text is referring to a daemon, probably alluding to Julian's own interpretation preserved above. The only other ancient Greek author who mentioned this exegesis is Theodoret (*Qu. in Lev.* 22) who had read Cyril's *Ep.* 41, as he himself reports in his own *Ep.* 83, and had therefore probably learned of the daemonic interpretation from the Alexandrian bishop, as suggested by Boulnois 2020b, 181–82 n. 59.

Julian

And listen also to what he says about the evil-averting[95] *[beings]: "And he shall take two rams from the goats for sin and a single ram for a whole burnt offering. And Aaron shall bring forward the bull calf for sin, which is for himself, and he shall make atonement for himself and for his house. And he shall take the two rams and place them before the Lord at the door of the tent of witness, and Aaron shall place upon the two rams one designation*[96] *for the Lord and one designation for the one who sends away,"*[97] *so as to send him forth, [Moses] says, as "a sending away" and "to let it go into the wilderness."*[98] [623]
So then, the ram that is sent to "the one who sends away" is sent forth in this manner, but as for the other ram he says, "And he shall slay the ram for the sin of the people before the Lord and bring its blood inside the curtain […] and he shall sprinkle the blood upon the foot of the altar and he shall make atonement for the holy places, because of the unclean things of the sons of Israel and because of their wrongs – concerning all their sins."[99]

Cyril

9.15 Now when he says "*evil-averting*,"[100] Julian is referring to "*the one to be sent off*,"[101] thereby introducing a new word that is not found in the

[95] Gk.: ἀποτροπαίων. On this term, see the note above at *c. Iul.* 9.13. Intriguingly, at *Cels*. 6.43 Origen used the cognate verbal form ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι when referring to the goat sent into the wilderness in this biblical passage. Note that Julian uses simply a substantival adjective, so it could be that he is referring to apotropaic sacrifices (so Boulnois' translation with her commentary at SC 624, 462 n. 2) or apotropaic gods (as we have taken it). According to Sozomen, when Julian became sole emperor, he himself engaged in apotropaic sacrifices to undo the effects of his baptism and required other Christian apostates to do the same (*H.e.* 5.2.2; 5.5.1). Julian himself references this requirement at *Ep*. 114 (p.193.22–23 Bidez) (= *Ep*. 41 [pp.130–31 Wright]), where he says Christians cannot take part in pagan rituals unless they first "offer sacrifices of purification and supplicate the evil-averting gods" (καθάρσια προσφέρεσθαι πρῶτον καὶ τοὺς ἀποτροπαίους ἱκετεύειν θεούς).

[96] Gk.: κλῆρον. Though this term is usually translated "lot" (cf. NETS), Cyril will below interpret it to refer to a "name," so we have opted for the more vague translation "designation" (*c. Iul.* 9.18.11–17).

[97] Gk.: ἀποπομπαίῳ. Like ἀποτροπαίοις, this term is also frustratingly ambiguous and can have either an active or passive sense, i.e., either that which sends something else away or that which is sent away (cf. Boulnois' comments at SC 624, 462–63 n. 3, who describes translating the term as "un monstrueux problème"). Julian undoubtedly understood it in the active sense, in parallel to his understanding of ἀποτροπαῖος as "evil-averting," referring to a divine being in the wilderness who receives the goat and averts evil. This is also how Cyril understood Julian; see his comments at *c. Iul.* 9.13.39–40; 9.15.1; 9.18.13–14. On the other hand, Cyril will interpret the word in the biblical passage in the passive sense as a reference to the goat itself that is "sent off" (see *c. Iul.* 9.18.15–17). Since it is impossible to maintain a single translation for the term in light of these competing usages, we have footnoted each occurrence of it to highlight the Greek term behind the translation.

[98] Lev 16:5–8, 10.

[99] *c. Gal.* fr. 70 Mas.; Wright 1923, 402–05. The final quotation is Lev 16:15–16. Julian seems to be paraphrasing somewhat here (e.g., using θυσιαστήριον in place of ἱλαστήριον) and is omitting a portion of the passage, marked by the ellipses above.

[100] Gk.: ἀποτρόπαιον. [101] Gk.: τὸν ἀποπομπαῖον.

sacred laws, though it is apparently a word familiar to him. And I cannot help but be amazed at this: though the law actually consists in shadows and riddles, he restricts it to its more obvious sense and thinks it has no concealed meaning. Yet it would presumably be clear to everyone that a parable and a riddle would be reflections of a different reality rather than
[624] whatever they might appear to be.

I mean something like the following (and here one must proceed via examples that in Julian's eyes possess not inconsiderable esteem).[102] They say that some of those who serve idols are designers[103] of riddles who have even been trained in this art with cleverness and skill, and it is customary for them also to call these people "hieroglyph carvers."[104] These people engrave markings on temples and obelisks and think it best not to use letters like ours; instead, by means of other figures they grant forms to the natures of things and thereby build up a kind of secret knowledge in those who have greater understanding. For wishing to

[102] Cyril's two examples of symbolic or figurative representation among the pagans are Egyptian hieroglyphs and Pythagorean enigmatic sayings. These had previously been linked together by Plutarch, *De Isid.* 354e–355a, who said Pythagoras "copied the symbolism and mysteriousness [of the Egyptian priests]." Porphyry likewise reported that Pythagoras spent time with Egyptian priests and learned hieroglyphs from them (*VP* 12 – the same text from which Cyril will quote in the next paragraph; cf. Porphyry, *Comm. Tim.* fr. 70 Sodano). Moreover, Porphyry's teacher Plotinus praised hieroglyphs as a superior mode of expression that did not rely on discursive reason (*Enn.* 5.8.6), and Clement of Alexandria claimed that while in Egypt Moses learned "the philosophy through symbols" which is made known "in hieroglyphic letters" (*Str.* 1.23.153.2). Elsewhere Clement again mentioned hieroglyphs and used them to make the same point as Cyril is here, namely that all those who speak about divine things, both barbarian and Greek, "veil the first principles of things" (*Str.* 5.4.20–21; cf. *Str.* 6.4.36.1).

[103] Greek: τεχνίτας, so perhaps also "skilled craftsmen" or "artisans."

[104] Greek: ἱερογλύφους, a rare word that shows up only four other times in the TLG database. All of the other occurrences are in astrological texts: Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatica* 4.4.7; Hephaestion, *Apotelesmatica* 170; Rhetorius, *Capitula selecta* 165; 212. Following the Christian takeover of the Serapeum under Cyril's uncle and episcopal predecessor Theophilus, much discussion arose over the meaning of hieroglyphic symbols discovered at the site and interpreted by some as foretelling the demise of paganism and the ascendancy of Christianity (Sozomen, *H.e.* 7.15.10; Socrates Scholasticus, *H.e.* 5.17; Rufinus, *H.e.* 11.29). As suggested by this episode, hieroglyphs were readily apparent in Egypt in Cyril's day, so using this as an example of symbolic communication would have had currency with local readers. For example, in front of the Caesareum complex containing his own cathedral church stood a pair of obelisks covered with hieroglyphic carvings that had been moved from Heliopolis to Alexandria by the Romans in 13/12 BC to adorn the temple dedicated to the imperial cult. (The obelisks are now located in Central Park, New York and the Thames Embankment, London. See McKenzie 2007, 177, 242.) Moreover, the topic continued to be of interest to Neoplatonists in Cyril's own day, as can be seen in the treatise known as the *Hieroglyphica*, which offers interpretations of a number of hieroglyphic symbols. It is attributed to a certain Horapollon, who is perhaps to be identified with one of the two Alexandrian teachers of philosophy with that name who were active in the late fifth century. See Goulet 2000. Moreover, Cyril's contemporary Shenoute, abbot of the famous White Monastery in Upper Egypt, in an untitled diatribe (A6) argued that hieroglyphs were idolatrous images that ought to be destroyed. See Westerfeld 2019.

make manifest the divine, or rather the nature that is supreme and surpasses all, they draw an eye and place under it a straight staff, in order that in this [symbol] one might perceive its all-seeing nature and surely its royal honor.[105] For the scepter is almost always taken to be a symbol of a kingdom, and indeed they intend for the staff's upright stature to signify that the divine nature is unable to buckle with weariness, but is always, as it were, standing as though sustaining and propping up all things. Furthermore, word has it that they inscribe a cobra[106] as a type for heaven on account of its circularity. Yet they also use a serpent for time, since it is long with many coils, and also creeps along without any sound.[107] In addition, hinting at anger in a riddling manner, they used to [625] carve a censer, as well as a fire kindled within it and then a heart hanging over it.[108]

9.16 Furthermore, Pythagoras did not despise riddling communication but held it in high regard. For Porphyry has written about him as follows in the first book of his *Philosophical History*:

> But there was also another kind of symbol, such as, "Do not step over a scale," that is, do not be covetous; "do not poke a fire with a sword," which meant that you should not incite an angry man swollen with rage by provocative words; "do not pluck a crown," that is, do not violate the laws, since laws are the crowns of cities. And there are others in addition to these: "do not eat the heart," that is, do not afflict yourself with sorrows; "do not sit upon a choenix,"[109] that is, do not live in a lazy manner; […] "do not receive swallows into your house," that is, do not take as housemates loquacious people who cannot control their tongues; "help someone to take up a burden but not to lay it down," by which he was encouraging people not to help anyone become indolent, but to help them become virtuous and work hard; "not to carry images of the gods on

[105] Presumably Cyril has in mind the Eye of Horus, also mentioned by Plutarch, *De Isid*. 354f–355a, who said it represents "the king and Lord Osiris."

[106] Gk.: ἀσπίδα. The term ἀσπίς can refer either to a shield or an Egyptian cobra, and it is difficult to determine which meaning Cyril has in mind and whether he may have misunderstood his source; see Boulnois, SC 624, 468 n. 1.

[107] Cf. Horapollon, *Hier*. 1.1, where a serpent (ὄφις) is said to represent "eternity" (αἰών) and *Hier*. 1.2 where a serpent devouring its own tail is said to indicate the "universe" (κόσμος). Cyril's mention of a "cobra" and a "serpent" seems to align with these two interpretations in inverse order.

[108] Horapollon said that this symbol designated Egypt itself (*Hier*. 1.22). Plutarch also mentioned it (*de Isid*. 355a), though the surviving text of his treatise is corrupt at this point, and Cyril's own text has been relied upon by various editors to emend Plutarch's text; see Boulnois, SC 624, 207–10.

[109] A χοῖνιξ was a dry measure used especially for corn, roughly equivalent to one person's daily allowance. So LSJ, s.v. χοῖνιξ I.

> rings," that is, one's opinion about the gods and conversations about them should not be offhand or manifest, nor should they be made known to the multitude.[110]

So then, if someone were to look at hieroglyphic letters or Pythagorean riddles and then claim that there is no surplus of meaning in them
[626] beyond their more overt aspects, wouldn't [Julian], who in our case restricts Moses' law to its mere letters, immediately say in frustration, "What on earth are you doing, sir? Don't focus[111] your mind only on their more overt aspects and don't distort the usage of riddles, which is most necessary for the affairs of this life. Instead, investigate[112] their concealed meanings and what is hinted at through them in a very oblique manner."[113]

9.17 Julian ought, then, to realize that he is distorting the law if he does not make an effort to regard it in the same manner. For we ourselves refine the crude materialism of the story[114] and, making a diligent search[115] for the secret import of its ideas, we claim that the mystery of Christ has been figuratively imprinted in the literal text in a riddling manner. This mystery is indeed also presented by Paul with great clarity when he says, "Each of you should have the mindset in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus, who, existing in the form of God, did not regard equality with God something to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant and being made in the likeness of humans. And being found in appearance as a human, he humbled himself, becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross."[116] For although it was possible for him to indulge himself in the privileges of his own nature and to show off, in a manner appropriate to his divinity, his incomparable excellencies over all things (for we hold that this is what is

[110] Porphyry, *VP* 42. Pythagorean proverbs were also highlighted in Clement, *Str.* 5.5.27.1–5.5.31.5; Theodoret, *Affect.* 8.1. Clement and Theodoret cite some of the same proverbs as in the passage above from Porphyry, though, as noted by Boulnois, Cyril's purpose for highlighting these proverbs differs from that of the two other Christian authors (SC 624, 470 n. 1).

[111] We suspect here a mistake in the printing of the GCS edition. The edition has the present active indicative form ἐνίῃς, which would mean Julian is saying the hypothetical Christian *is not* focusing his mind upon what is outwardly apparent. However, the addition of an iota subscript (ἐνιῇς) would make the form subjunctive and so parallel to the subsequent verb ἀδικήσῃς, giving the sense that one *should not* focus upon only what is external.

[112] Gk.: πολυπραγμόνει; cf. Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 2.6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.7.4 with note).

[113] In a manner somewhat similar to Cyril's argument in *c. Iul.* 9.15–16, Origen chastised Celsus for unfairly maintaining that Greek myths have an allegorical meaning but refusing to extend that approach to the Bible (*Cels.* 4.38–50).

[114] Gk.: τὸ … τῆς ἱστορίας πάχος (literally, "the thickness of the story").

[115] Gk.: περιεργαζόμενοι.

[116] Phil 2:5–8. On Cyril's interpretation of this Pauline passage, see Magree 2024, 204–76.

meant by "the joy set before him"),[117] he emptied himself by descending into our condition, in order that, having endured a fleshly death on behalf of all and then trampling upon it by his resurrection from the [627]
dead, he might enable us to sprint back to life, even making it a smooth journey for us.[118] For as the priest of his mysteries himself says in another passage, "For just as through a man came death, so also through a man came resurrection from the dead, […] and just as we carried the image of the earthly man, let us also carry the image of the heavenly man."[119] Yet when he had been raised from the dead, he graciously gave himself to the herds of the nations since Israel behaved towards him like a drunken person and drove headlong into the deep pit of ill counsel. For as Moses has written, "the beloved one kicked away,"[120] meaning that he has somehow jumped off and, having completely run away from the love that was shown to him, has been left behind without any share in divine goods. [628]

9.18 Observe then, yes observe, the mystery and how it was skillfully sketched in outline in the two rams. For a young goat or a ram[121] used to be slaughtered on behalf of the sins of the priest and of the people, in accordance with what the law stipulated. And since "Christ has been sacrificed"[122] on behalf of our sins, he is comparable to a ram. For as the prophet Isaiah says, "All of us like sheep have gone astray, a man has gone astray in his own way, and the Lord gave him over to our sins."[123] Now *two* rams are taken, not on the understanding that there are two Christs or two sons, as some maintain,[124] but rather because the same one had to

[117] Heb 12:2. Note that most translations regard the ἀντί of this verse to mean Jesus endured the cross "*for the sake of* the joy set before him," though Cyril's interpretation takes the preposition to mean "instead of"; i.e., Jesus chose to become incarnate "instead of" reveling in the "joy set before him" as God.

[118] The preceding sentence also appears as a fragment in the catena tradition and was included in Pusey's edition of Cyril's *Commentary on Hebrews*, as is also the case at *c. Iul.* 3.41; 8.7; 10.25. See *Heb*. 12:2 (413.13–20 Pusey).

[119] 1 Cor 15:21, 49. [120] Deut 32:15.

[121] Cyril here uses two synonyms for male goats: χίμαρος and τράγος, both of which occur in the LXX tradition of the relevant passage from Lev 16. In his citation of the passage above, Julian used only τράγος.

[122] Cf. 1 Cor 5:7. [123] Isa 53:6.

[124] With the phrase "as some maintain" (κατά τινας), Cyril is referring to the sort of Christological dualism whose most prominent proponents up to this point had been the so-called "Antiochene" theologians Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Following the election of Nestorius as patriarch of Constantinople in 428 and the ensuing controversy over the Marian term Theotokos ("bearer of God"), opposing Christological dualism became Cyril's central project for the remainder of his career, first in the person of Nestorius and later with respect to the writings of Diodore and Theodore. However, even in his writings composed prior to 428, he was already engaged in polemic against this position, always being careful, as he is here, not to name his opponents. In taking this approach Cyril was following the precedent of Gregory of Nazianzus,

be seen, on the one hand, being slaughtered for our sake and dying in the flesh while, on the other hand, living in the Spirit.[125] And the "designations" and names for the rams are "the Lord" for one and "the one to be sent off"[126] for the other.[127] For it was not the case that [Moses] commanded them to release the goat that avoids slaughter to a kind daemon that "*sends away*"[128] and "*averts evil*,"[129] as His Excellency Julian, says; instead it was called "the one sent off,"[130] seeing that it was also sent away[131] from the slaughter, just as was doubtless also true of the Lord who was slaughtered.

So, by means of both goats, as I said, there was depicted the one Christ who both died for our sakes according to the flesh and is shown to be
[629] superior to death, that is, with respect to the nature of his divinity. Furthermore, he was sent out into the wilderness, since land that is wild and uncultivated typifies in itself the barrenness of the nations. For we will find it also to have been named such by the holy prophets. For example, it has been written, "Rejoice, O thirsty wilderness! Let the wilderness be glad and let it blossom like a lily."[132] And again, "Rejoice, O

who similarly opposed those who spoke of "two sons" or "two Christs," though without naming the Antiochene targets of his polemic (*Ep.* 101.18–21; *Ep.* 102.4; *Or.* 22.13; *Or.* 37.2). For similar passages appearing in works from this part of Cyril's career in which he opposes the notion of "two Christs" or "two sons," see *Glaph. Gen.* 3 (PG 69.129c); *Glaph. Lev.* (PG 69.560c); *Jo.* 6:61–62; 9:37; 14:1; 14:24; 20:30–31 (1.550; 2.200; 2.402; 505; 3.154 Pusey); *Ep. Fest.* 8.6.15–21; 11.8.50–53; *Is.* 45:14–16 (PG 70.973a); *Inc. Unigen.* 689–90. On Cyril's early Christology, see Liébaert 1951; Fairbairn 2003, 63–104. When Cyril later treats this Levitical passage at greater length in his exchange with Acacius in the year 432, he again opposes the view that the passage teaches Christological dualism (*Ep.* 41.18–20). On the relevance of the above passage for dating *c. Iul.*, see Boulnois 2020b, 179–82.

125 That is, the goat that is slaughtered on behalf of sins represents Christ's death, while the goat that "lives" (ζῶντα, cf. Lev 16:10, 20) represents his resurrection by the Spirit (for Christ's status "according to the flesh" and "according to the Spirit," see Rom 1:3–4, with Boulnois, SC 624, 476 n. 2). Cyril's sometime nemesis Theodoret offered a similar exegesis of the two goats in *Qu. in Lev.* 22, denying that they refer to two πρόσωπα but instead to Christ's two φύσεις, the flesh that has the quality of "passibility" (τὸ παθητόν) and the deity that possesses "impassibility" (τὸ ἀπαθές).

126 Greek: ἀποπομπαῖος.

127 It is not immediately apparent what leads Cyril to conclude that the "designations" (κλῆροι, literally "lots") mentioned in the Leviticus passage are in fact "names" (ὀνόματα) for the two goats. Perhaps he was following ancient grammarians who thought the word κλῆρος was related to the verb καλέω ("to call" or "to name"). Cf. Philoxenus, fr. 117; Orion, *Etymologicum*, s.v. κλῆρος; *Etymologicum Gudianum*, s.v. κλῆρος; *Etymologicum Magnum*, s.v. κλῆρος. Note that Cyril uses the verb in the final sentence of the paragraph (ἐκαλεῖτο). He therefore seems to be giving an etymological interpretation of the κλῆροι bestowed by Aaron upon the goats, viewing them as names for the goats themselves rather than as designations for other beings to whom the goats are dedicated, such as Julian's "evil-averting daemon."

128 Gk.: ἀποπομπαίῳ. 129 Gk.: ἀποτρόπαίῳ. 130 Gk.: ἀποπομπαῖος.

131 Gk.: ἀποπεμπόμενος. Cyril here uses the present passive participle of the verb cognate to the adjective ἀποπομπαῖος that occurs in the Leviticus passage.

132 Isa 35:1.

barren one who does not bear; break forth and shout, you who are not in labor! For the children of the wilderness are more than the one who has a husband."[133] And once more another example: "And I will make water in the wilderness and rivers in a dry place. I will make the wilderness into marshlands and will provide the thirsty land with water channels. I will put in the dry land a cedar and a box tree and a myrtle tree and a cypress and a white poplar."[134] For indeed the synagogue of the Jews, which was yoked to the law almost as if it were a husband, bore its fruit and in fact had many children, although, as the sacred writing says, "the children of the wilderness are more than the one who has a husband." For those from the nations who have believed greatly outnumber those from the synagogue of the Jews. And though they were desolate and dry, they have born as fruit the lofty heads of the saints who are very appropriately compared to a cedar, a box tree, and the other kinds of trees. And also rivers and canals have appeared in this wilderness, that is, the apostles and evangelists, along with the interpreters and teachers of the sacred doctrines, who implant the divine word from heaven into the souls of [630] those who are undergoing initiation and, as it were, irrigate the hearts of believers with intellectual streams.

9.19 Moreover, the riddle in the case of the rams could be appropriately understood by us in another sense as well; for while it is undoubtedly true that the goat is taken for the sake of sins and is dedicated to God as the law requires, sometimes a goat can also intimate the sinful people themselves. For because a sheep has fleece and produces wool as a kind of fruit,[135] it typifies in itself the character[136] of the saints. But since these qualities do not hold true for goats, they usually signify people who are sterile in an intellectual sense. And the Son does not leave us in doubt on this point since he asserts that he will come from heaven as a judge and, sitting on "the throne of his glory," "he will place the sheep on his right and the goats on his left."[137] And he plainly shows that he likens the righteous to sheep and the others to goats, since he says to those standing on his right, "Come, you who are blessed by my Father; inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the

[133] Isa 54:1. [134] Isa 43:19–20; 41:18–19.

[135] Our translation here expands somewhat upon the Greek which reads ἡ … ὅϊς ὡς εὔερός τε καί ἔγκαρπος (literally, "the sheep, as both fleecy and fruitful"). Cyril seems to be making an analogy on the basis of the sheep's "fruitfulness," which would consist in the fact that it produces wool that can be used for human purposes, presumably unlike goats, which are in this respect "unfruitful." Sheep therefore are an appropriate image for the saints, since they too are "fruitful."

[136] Greek: πρόσωπον. [137] Matt 25:31, 33.

world," yet to those on his left, "Depart from me, you who are accursed, into the eternal fire."[138]

With that point established, come now and let us give a cursory over-
[631] view of the manner of the economy[139] with flesh. "There was no one who does good, not even one," as the psalmist says.[140] And all of us were in sin, since neither was the law able to make those from the bloodline of Israel to be just, nor was the multitude of the Greeks acquainted with the path of the blameless life. Hence, with everyone being sinful, the only-begotten Word of God, without undergoing any change or variation, became flesh, that is, a human.[141] And he "committed no sin," though "he appeared to us in the likeness of sinful flesh" and was "reckoned among the lawless," insofar as he became flesh and bore the title of "human."[142] For example, the all-wise Paul has written at one point about God the Father and also about the Son himself, "He made the one who knew no sin to be sin for our sake."[143] That is, he became a sacrifice for sin. Now those animals slaughtered on behalf of sins used to take on the name "sins," and this was especially true for rams and young goats more than the rest. For example, through one of the prophets God has at one point said about the divine priests, to whom were assigned the perquisites from the sacrifices, "They will eat the sins of my people,"[144] meaning those offerings from the sacrifices on behalf of sins.[145] And so, as I said, the only-begotten appeared to us in a form like ours and was "reckoned with
[632] the lawless," and indeed, in keeping with the meaning of the law's riddles, he became a kid[146] among kids or a ram among rams.

9.20 The law has thus commanded that two kids or rams be taken, so that through this detail Christ might be understood as one of us in the sense of having a nature and form identical to a human in relation to another human, just as, of course, is true also for a goat in relation to another goat. And having become like us, he endured the same death that hangs over us, that is, death according to the flesh, in order that he might send us away[147] from death and corruption. Someone might observe that this very thing too is fulfilled in the fact that there were two rams, since of the two, one was slaughtered and offered to God "as a

[138] Matt 25:34, 41. [139] Gk.: οἰκονομίας. [140] Ps 13(14):1. [141] Cf. John 1:14.
[142] This sentence is a pastiche of 1 Pet 2:22; Rom 8:3; Isa 53:9, 12. [143] 2 Cor 5:21.
[144] Hos 4:8.
[145] Cyril makes the same point – that sacrificial victims for sin take on the name "sin" – at *Ador.* 12 (PG 68.840b), citing the same passages from 2 Corinthians and Hosea.
[146] Cyril here introduces into his discussion the word ἔριφος, referring to a young goat, probably just for stylistic variation.
[147] Greek: ἀποπέμψῃ, the verb cognate to the adjective ἀποπομπαῖος used in the Levitical passage.

pleasing aroma,"[148] while the other was sent away from the slaughter. For "one" who is more worthy than all "died on behalf of all,"[149] and Christ's death was the dissolution of death. And this is what the import of the law's riddles is hinting at for us.

But as for those people whose minds are fixated on the mere letter and who understand nothing that is hidden within it, we can take as the starting point for our argument the very ideas we are currently handling and show without any difficulty that they have both completely abandoned the truth and are making a laughable objection. For Julian himself says,[150]

> *So then, the ram that is sent to "the one who sends away" is sent forth in this manner, but as for the other ram he says, "And he shall slay the one for the sin of the people before the Lord and bring its blood inside the curtain and he shall sprinkle the blood upon the foot of the altar and he shall make atonement for the holy places, because of the unclean things of the sons of Israel and because of their wrongs – concerning all their sins."*[151] [633]

Well then, if he thinks there is such great potency in the blood of slaughtered rams that it can even set those for whom they were slaughtered free from every impurity and indeed every injustice as well, why did the law ordain penalties and punishments for offenders? For when it comes to adulterers and murderers, in addition to pederasts,[152] sorcerers, enchanters, and indeed also apostates, it has commanded that from them all there must be exacted a payment in blood, without mercy.[153] Why, then, was it necessary for those who had sinned to be in dire peril if the slaughter of the ram, or rather its blood, sufficed for the washing away of every impurity? For surely no one would say that those in peril had a lack of rams! Rather, as the most wise Paul says (and he had Christ, who is the truth, in him),[154] "The blood of bulls and goats is powerless to take away sin."[155]

[148] A phrase that is common in the LXX and also found in the New Testament. Cf. Exod 29:18; Eph 5:2.

[149] Cf. 2 Cor 5:14.

[150] Aside for a slight omission, the following is taken from *c. Gal.* fr. 70.18–24 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.14.14–20).

[151] Lev 16:15–16.

[152] Cyril here uses the extremely rare word παιδοφίλης, which occurs only seven other times in the TLG database. LSJ defines it as synonymous with the more common παιδεραστής.

[153] Most of the offenses in this list are covered in passages such as Deut 22:22; Lev 20:10; Gen 9:6; Lev 20:27; Deut 13:6–10; 18:10–11; 17:2–7. The exception is pederasty. Perhaps Cyril has in mind the prohibition against homosexual acts in Lev 18:22; 20:13. He may be following Eusebius, *P.e.* 8.7.1, who cited a passage from Philo's *Hypothetica*, which emphasized the severity of the Mosaic law in ordaining a penalty of death for those who committed such offenses, including both adulterers and pederasts (cf. Colson 1985, LCL 363.422–23). The notion of punishment "without mercy" is a conceptual (though not verbal) echo of Jas 2:13.

[154] Cf. 2 Cor 13:3. [155] Heb 10:4.

We will, then, precisely define the law's falsity.[156] For if the blood of bulls and goats did not suffice for the washing away of sin, why does the one who legislated it say, "and he shall make atonement for the holy places, because of the unclean things of the sons of Israel and because of their wrongs – concerning all their sins"?[157] Was he therefore
[634] mistaken in his speech? Perish the thought! What, then, are we to make of these considerations? It is probably clear and evident to everyone that the truth is brought to light not in the riddles themselves but rather in the realities signified through them. For Christ is the blameless sacrifice, the sacred victim, and, since he has died in the flesh for us, we ourselves have become "sent-off,"[158] meaning we have left behind death and corruption. For we have been redeemed by his blood and have been set free from every impurity,[159] "being made just freely by his grace,"[160] as it is written, and gaining the gift of amnesty by God's mercy.

9.21 Furthermore, this man, who understands nothing of such sacred mysteries, imagined that Christians completely disregard the inspired utterances that came through the all-wise Moses and have even chosen to depart from them as if they tended to bring contamination and were plagued with disrepute for that very reason, despite the fact that Paul has clearly written, "So then the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good," and Christ himself, the Savior of us all, says, "Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets. I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them."[161] But he, as I said, under-
[635] stands nothing!

[156] Gk.: Καθοριοῦμεν οὖν ἄρα τοῦ νόμου τὸ ψεῦδος. Oecolampadius found this sentence so confusing that he simply omitted it from his translation, along with the "if" clause of the subsequent sentence. As Boulnois observes (SC 624, 488 n. 1), Cyril will go on to argue that the law's "falsity" lies solely in its literal sense understood apart from its Christological fulfillment. See also the very similar phrasing at *c. Iul.* 9.27.22: καθοριοῦμεν εἰκότως τὸ ἀδρανὲς τῶν τύπων ("it is only reasonable for us to determine that the types are inadequate"). It would also be possible to interpret the use of the future tense here (καθοριοῦμεν) as in keeping with Cyril's frequent use of the future for stating the logical implication of hypothetical positions being entertained. On that reading, he would be stating an absurd hypothetical position that he does not endorse and the sentence could be translated, "In that case, then we will have to declare that the law is wrong" (cf. the German translation). See also the similar phrasing at *c. Iul.* 8.25.27, where Julian is the understood subject and is said to be "declaring the words of the Holy Spirit to be a lie" (τῶν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λόγων καθορίσαι τὸ ψεῦδος).

[157] Lev 16:15–16. [158] Gk.: ἀποπομπαῖοι. [159] Cf. 1 Pet 1:18–19; Tit 2:14. [160] Rom 3:24.

[161] Rom 7:12; Matt 5:17. The passage from Matthew was also cited in a programmatic way at the outset of Cyril's lengthy treatise *De adoratione* in which he provided a spiritual reading of the cultic prescriptions in the Mosaic law (*De ador.* 1 [PG 68.133b–136a]). Immediately after citing Matt 5:17, Cyril next quoted John 4:21–24, a passage he will echo several times in the following section of *c. Iul.*

Julian

Therefore, he says, *it is clear from what has been said that Moses was an expert in the sacrificial methods.*[162] *But hear again from his own words that he did not regard them as impure, as you do: "But the soul, which, if it should eat any of the meat of the sacrifice of deliverance, which is the Lord's, his uncleanness will also be upon him – that soul shall be utterly destroyed from his people."*[163] *This is how cautious Moses was in the case of eating holy things.*[164]

Cyril

So then, the one responsible for subjecting believers in Christ to such insipid accusations will again have to learn the truth from us: we have abstained from the decrees in the law not because they are unclean; instead we proceed from the types to the truth. And, in my view, it ought to be clear to every person that anything employed as a type of something else does not exist for its own sake but in order that it might introduce a certain foreshadowing of what will later come to pass for the benefit of those who observe it. But when the truth is seen, the type is in a sense [636]
now superfluous and to continue prefiguring it is useless. And since the law that came through Moses gives birth to the form of the truth,[165] it too is holy. For the truth (that is, Christ[166] or rather his mystery) is holy.

9.22 But he once more indicts us on the grounds that we regard worship in Spirit and truth[167] as more important and superior to worship in shadows and types, and he says,

Julian

Finally, it is appropriate that I should recall what I said previously, since that is also the reason I have said these things. Why is it that, having deserted us, you neither cherish the law of the Jews nor adhere to what it says?[168] *No doubt some sharp-sighted person will say, "Neither do the Jews sacrifice." But I will prove that he is actually terribly shortsighted, in the first place because you do*

[162] Gk.: τοὺς τῶν θυσιῶν … τρόπους.

[163] Lev 7:10(20). As observed by Boulnois, this passage is almost never quoted by earlier Christian authors, which highlights Julian's detailed study of the biblical text (SC 624, 491 n. 3). He will make a further allusion to this chapter of Leviticus in the next fragment.

[164] *c. Gal.* fr. 71 Mas.; Wright 1923, 404–05. [165] Cf. Rom 2:20. [166] Cf. John 14:6.

[167] The phrase "worship in Spirit and truth" derives from John 4:23–24. Variations of the phrase are used throughout Cyril's corpus, though only a handful of times in *c. Iul.* See *c. Iul.* 4.16.24; 9.27.8–9; 9.29.36–37; 9.41.21–22.

[168] Julian here recalls the accusation of a double apostasy, already mentioned at *c. Gal.* frs. 3; 58 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 2.9; 7.28).

not preserve any of the other Jewish customs either, and in the second place, because the Jews in fact do sacrifice in < … >[169] *and even to this day eat all their offerings and pray before sacrificing and give the right shoulder to the*
[637] *priests as firstfruits,*[170] *but since they have been deprived of the temple and the altar – or, as they customarily call it, "the holy place"*[171] *– they are prevented from offering the firstfruits of the sacrificial victims to God.*[172] *But you who have invented the new sacrifice and as far as I can tell have no need of Jerusalem, why do you not sacrifice? And yet it is superfluous for me to have asked you this, since I already said as much at the outset when I was attempting to show that the Jews agree with the nations except for supposing that there is only one God (for that is peculiar to them and alien to us), since all the rest is, in a sense, common to us: temples, sanctuaries, altars, purifications, and certain precepts; with respect to all these things we differ from one another either not at all or in trivial details.*[173]

Cyril

9.23 Now if his intention was to join in with the Jews' frivolity and if he values above all being completely ignorant of what is essential for edification, let him take the spoils and may no one begrudge him! As for us, we will stick to the highway and will take the straight path to the truth, having said farewell to the pointless counsel of them both.[174] But since he

[169] Gk.: ἀδράτοις. Following Boulnois' lead, we are leaving untranslated this difficult word that is marked off by daggers in the GCS edition. Most editors of *c. Iul.* and *c. Gal.* have regarded the text as corrupt on the assumption that the adjective is nonsensical. The word ἄδρατος is derived from the cognate verb δράω which means "to do, accomplish"; with an alpha privative, the adjective means "not done." It is an extremely rare word, occurring only in this passage and in Phrynichus, *Preparatio sophistica* 9.2, where it is glossed with ἀποίητα. The verb δράω often has ritualistic connotations (cf. LSJ, s.v. δράω II – "*offer sacrifice* or *perform mystical rites*"; τὰ δρώμενα can simply mean "the rites"). Although it is not supported in the lexica, it might, therefore, be possible to take ἀδράτοις to mean "they sacrifice with rites that should not be performed," which could refer to private or secret rites as opposed to public ones, or could indicate that their sacrifices are not in accordance with the Mosaic law, since the law restricted sacrifice to the Jerusalem temple, which no longer existed. On this issue see Finkelstein 2018, 75–76, who follows the conjectural emendation ἀδράκτοις (meaning "someplace hidden or not seen or private," in line with Oecolampadius' reading *in propriis*) and points out that some Jews continued slaughtering a lamb in their homes for Passover, which they may have understood as a sacrifice. See also Ritter 2020, 17 n. 6.

[170] Cf. Lev 7:22–24. [171] This designation is also mentioned in Origen, *Cels*. 2.78.

[172] Julian here admits that the absence of the temple in Jerusalem is a hindrance to Jewish sacrifice. The necessity of sacrifice in the Jerusalem temple is also raised in *c. Gal.* frs. 76.3–4; 85.25–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.46.4–6; 10.31.30–32). In fact, in early 363, during the same period when he was writing *c. Gal.* in Antioch, Julian initiated a plan to have the Jewish temple rebuilt. The project got underway but came to an abrupt halt on May 18–19, 363 due to an earthquake. Julian's attempted rebuilding of the temple was mentioned in a number of late antique Christian sources, so it is somewhat surprising that Cyril shows no awareness of it or, if he does know of it, chooses not to mention it in his response to the above fragment. See Levenson 2004; Bradbury 2020; Boulnois, SC 624, 605–09.

[173] *c. Gal.* fr. 72 Mas.; Wright 1923, 404–07. [174] i.e., both the Jews and the Greeks like Julian.

has directly asked us a question, saying, "*Why is it that, having deserted us, you neither cherish the law of the Jews nor adhere to what it says?*" and "*Why do you not sacrifice?*",[175] we answer that, since he has not had the light of the truth shine upon him, he regarded as lawbreakers those who in fact scrupulously follow it, using sacrifices that are pleasing to God and not [638] carrying out a worship that he does not want, that is, a worship via flesh and blood.[176] Or perhaps for some reason Julian supposed that the God who truly exists by nature revels in the slaughter of animals, even though some who came before him, despite being stuck in superstitions identical to his own, said with the utmost clarity that approaching [the divine] through blood is somehow detestable even to their own gods.

9.24 For example, at one point in the second book of his *On Abstinence from Ensouled Things* Porphyry says the following: "The fact that those who studied the powers in the universe were bringing their blood sacrifices not to gods but to daemons is something the theologians have also confirmed."[177] And he also adduces a certain saying of a poet that goes as follows:

> Who is so stupid, and so extremely lax,
> Who among men so credulous to hope all the gods rejoice,
> When bile and fleshless bones are burnt,
> And take that as their prize,
> Which is inedible even to ravenous dogs?[178]

And indeed he also elsewhere says sacrifices in blood are detestable to the gods, writing once more as follows: "Although in ancient times divine law did not arrange these things in this manner, they nevertheless honored [639] each of the divine beings with crops. For those rituals were pleasing both to nature and to the overall perception of the human soul."[179] And he also joins together these words with the saying of the poet:

> The altar was not drenched by the indiscriminate murder of bulls
> Rather, this was viewed by humans as a great pollution,
> To wrench away their spirit and to devour their limbs as prey.[180]

[175] These two quotations come from *c. Gal.* fr. 72.4–5, 15 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.22.6–7, 17).
[176] Similar statements about the law and its ordinances not being "wanted" by God can be found at *c. Iul.* 4.16.9; 9.26.21; fr. 39.
[177] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.58.1. This passage was also quoted by Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.15.2. On the passages from Porphyry's *Abst.* cited here and in what follows, see Boulnois, SC 624, 189–93.
[178] TrGF Adespota fr. 118 Nauck, of unknown authorship. Porphyry includes this passage at *Abst.* 2.58.4, nine lines down from the passage just quoted by Cyril. Prior to Porphyry, it was also mentioned by Clement, *Str.* 7.6.34.3.
[179] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.27.6–7.
[180] This passage comes from Empedocles, fr. 31 B 128.22–24 D-K (= D25.8–10 Laks/Most). It was also cited in Eusebius, *P.e.* 4.14.7, who likewise drew the passage from Porphyry.

> One may also see this from the altar at Delos which is preserved to the present day: since no animal is brought to it by them or sacrificed upon it, it has been called the Altar of the Pious. Thus, not only did they abstain from animals when sacrificing, but they also gave a share of piety both to those who founded the altar and likewise to those who use it.[181]

9.25 So then, when the altar among the Delians has been called "altar of the pious," though no animals were slaughtered upon it, why does Julian bring baseless criticisms of our acts of virtue that transcend the law and why does he arraign those who say God does not revel in blood sacrifices but instead longs for veneration and worship "in Spirit and in truth"?[182] Yet he likely will respond, "Why, then, do we see him making such divine utterances? Or has Moses perhaps tricked the ancients by adding to each of the laws the phrase 'Thus says the Lord'?" We will
[640] respond to this point also. Moses was no liar, but rather was an authentic minister of words from God. Nevertheless, the law, in its literal sense,[183] was "an instructor of the foolish" and "a teacher of children"[184] – so at least said Paul, who is well educated in the law – and, by commanding them to use its more overt meaning as the basic elements and first principles of their lessons,[185] it permitted [them] to rehearse the truth by means of types and to be drilled with exercises befitting children, at least for a time.[186] For it was nearly impossible for those descended from Israel, whose mind had only recently been established in piety, to succeed in rendering veneration and worship "in Spirit and in truth" and to endure the sweat required for such a holy and most pure kind of life – I mean the life that accords with the gospel. For virtue is hard to achieve and is not won by meager efforts.

It seems to me that one of the Greek poets has put it best:

> How can one accomplish great achievements with slight exertions?
> [641] It is stupid even to wish for such things.[187]

[181] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.27.7–28.1. [182] John 4:23. [183] Gk.: ἐν γράμμασι, literally "in letters."
[184] Rom 2:20. [185] Gk.: τισι στοιχείοις καὶ μαθημάτων ἀρχαῖς.
[186] Cyril uses similar imagery at *Ep. Fest.* 23.3 (PG 77.877a). Chrysostom also employed this metaphor to describe the kind of instruction provided by Moses, stating that he, like a teacher of children, offered τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα, in contrast to John and Paul who taught τὰ τελειότερα (*Hom. in Gen.* 2.3 [PG 53.29]). See also Origen, *Cels.* 5.42 who makes a similar point though he, unlike Cyril, was willing to refer to the stories of the Hebrew scriptures as "myths."
[187] Euripides, *Or.* 694–95. Some editors have regarded these two lines of Euripides' play as spurious. See Diggle 1994, III: 229. The passage was also cited in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 1.36.1.8–9. Cyril and the author of the *De Trinitate* appear to be the only ancient authors to cite these lines. Ps-Didymus does not give the source of the quotation but simply uses φασίν to introduce it. The context of the citation in *De Trinitate* has to do with the difficulty of discussing divine matters, while Cyril's concern is with the difficulty of attaining virtue. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 202–04.

Furthermore, the lawgiver himself would declare that exceptional precision with respect to being able to live well and in terms of doctrinal subtlety was a burden nearly too heavy to bear for the minds of the Jews; for he says at one point through the voice of Isaiah, "You have neither known nor understood, nor did I open your ears from the beginning. For I knew that, disbelieving, you would disbelieve."[188] For the Israel of old suffered from ignorance, disobedience, and an extreme fickleness[189] to such a degree that, when Moses was receiving the law from God and dwelling on the mountain, they turned to apostasy and dared to ascribe veneration to a calf and indeed even sang praises to it with the words "These are your gods, Israel, who led you up from the land of Egypt."[190] Having such an impotent mind that was so easily swayed to the worse course, how could they have handled the lessons of the gospel, and consequently even dedicate to God intellectual worship as a form of spiritual sacrifice, and, in place of the slaughter of animals, the fragrance from the virtues? Hence, they used to sacrifice sheep, oxen, rams, turtledoves, and doves.

9.26 One can, however, also observe the skill of the divine accommodation[191] even in these rituals and consider it worthy of complete admiration. For because they had become accustomed to perform these rites while in Egypt, he permitted them to perform their sacrifices, and, drawing them up, as it were, little by little to a blameless state,[192] he was fashioning "*the sacrificial methods*"[193] not in the form familiar to them, but instead planned with such skill and wisdom that they would give [642]
birth to the form of the intellectual worship in themselves. Here is an example: the lamb was sacrificed when those from Israel quite rightly performed all the requirements of the festival at the time of the Passover in Egypt. However, it was not sacrificed in a simple manner but, as I said, with wisdom. For it was taken on the tenth day of the first month and

[188] Isa 48:8. Cyril's version departs from the LXX in several points, most notably in having ἀπειθῶν ἀπειθήσεις ("disbelieving, you would disbelieve") in place of ἀθετῶν ἀθετήσεις ("rejecting, you would reject"). The only other ancient author to cite this exact form is Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 16 Albl (PG 46.224b), though a similar version is cited in Ps-Anastasius, *Jud. al.* (PG 89.1276d).

[189] In the prologue to *c. Iul.* Cyril describes the intended readers of his book with this same word (εὐπαρακόμιστος), which literally means "easy to steer" (*c. Iul.* Dedic.3.11). The point is that certain people are "fickle" in the sense of being easily led astray.

[190] Exod 32:4. [191] Gk.: τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας.

[192] The next several paragraphs are a more extended elaboration of the argument presented more briefly at *c. Iul.* 4.16–17.

[193] Gk.: τοὺς τῶν θυσιῶν … τρόπους. Julian uses this same phrase above at *c. Gal.* fr. 71.1–2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.11), and Cyril attributes the phrase to Julian at *c. Iul.* 9.13.18; 9.14.2–3; 10.40.51–2. Cyril will reappropriate it for his own argument again at 9.26.16–17; 10.27.11; 10.28.2–3; 10.30.3. For an early anticipation, see *c. Iul.* 4.15.16.

was slaughtered on the fourteenth day at evening under the light of lamps,[194] and the very dress of the participants was stipulated as the law saw fit. For it says, "This is the manner in which you shall eat it: let your loins be girded, with sandals on your feet and with staffs in your hands and eat it with haste. It is the Lord's Passover."[195] And, for each of the sacrifices, a certain "*method*" was prescribed, not haphazardly, but with some secret sketched within it.[196] And were we to choose to discuss fully the purport of the details of each of them, our account of these sacrifices would become a lengthy one.

But now we must go on to something else, for I think it is necessary to prove that the worship prescribed in the law was not something God wanted, at least, that is, insofar as it concerns the letter and types.[197] For frequently one can hear him clearly saying things like this through the voice of the prophets: "For who sought these things from your hands? You shall not continue trampling upon my court. If you should bring fine wheat flour, it would be futile. Incense is abhorrent to me. My soul
[643] hates your new moons and your Sabbaths and I cannot bear the great day. My soul hates your fasting and holidays and feasts."[198] And again, "Your whole burnt offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices do not delight me."[199] And through the divine David, "I will not accept calves from your house nor young goats from your flocks. […] Surely I shall not eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats, will I? Sacrifice to God a sacrifice of praise."[200] And again, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice, and knowledge of God more than a whole burnt offering."[201] And indeed even the Son himself has been introduced through the voice of David saying to God the Father in the heavens, "Sacrifice and offering you have not desired, but a body you have prepared for me. […] Then I said, Behold I have come […] to do your will, O God."[202]

9.27 But our adversary will probably reply, "Yet surely the one who is God according to nature should manifestly be superior to having second
[644] thoughts; he should have chosen the better course at the outset and not

[194] Cf. Exod 12:3, 6. The mention of lamps could be a conflation of the Passover ordinance with Luke 12:35, as noted by Boulnois, SC 624, 508 n. 1.

[195] Exod 12:11.

[196] Cyril curiously refrains from explaining the spiritual meaning of the Passover ceremony that he claims it contains, though he will revisit this passage and elaborate further at *c. Iul.* 10.25.1–13. For his treatment of this topic in his other works, see the survey in Boulnois, SC 624, 609–11.

[197] Similar statements about the law and its ordinances not being "wanted" by God can be found at *c. Iul.* 4.16.9; 9.23.11; fr. 39.

[198] Isa 1:12–14. [199] Jer 6:20. [200] Ps 49(50):9, 13–14. [201] Hos 6:6. Cf. Matt 9:13; 12:7.

[202] Ps 39(40):7–9. The version of this passage that Cyril cites is that found in Heb 10:5–7, which differs from the LXX.

have instilled in the minds of those under the law a sacrifice that he now repudiates."[203] On the contrary, Your Excellency, we respond as follows: he has, as I said, ordained laws in shadows and types through the all-wise Moses, since he knew that presenting them in types would be a lesson appropriate to the minds of those being tutored, certainly not so that they would dwell forever upon such gross, material meanings, and thus slip away from the intellectual worship in the Spirit, but in order that they would, by receiving a foreshadowing of truer meanings in types, become well acquainted with the [correct] manner of approaching [God], rushing down the path of true well-being with the utmost skill and expertise. For it is like those experts in the coppersmith's craft who have obtained a marvelous reputation in it: they usefully give a preview of the shape of what they will make by melting wax, not so as to stop there with their artistic aspirations, but so that, as I said, the beauty of those things that are about to be made might, in anticipation, shine forth in them (yet when their projects have attained their perfection, we no longer have a right to censure the artisan for disregarding the types).[204] I think that, according to the same method and rationale, now that Christ, who is the truth, has shown forth and now that the worship through him [645] has been introduced, it is only reasonable for us to determine that the types are inadequate. For they are images of intelligible realities.

Come now and let us consider the following: what things might God take delight in and what might be pleasing to him? A calf kneeling down for the slaughter? Or, say, a sheep that has been brought forward for this purpose and the smoke of incense spiraling upwards from the censer? Or a soul conspicuous for its diverse array of virtues? Let us consider, if you like, someone who is enrolled among the Jews, a circumcised lover of sacrifice, who does not yet have good habits, who isn't a companion of reasonableness, but is instead lascivious, a doer of shameful things, lacking self-control in his speech, who has not left any disreputable thing untried. And let us consider someone else who does not belong to those descended from Israel, who is uncircumcised according to the flesh and does not perform blood sacrifices but is instead admirable in his habits, self-controlled, reasonable, impervious to greed, succumbing to none of those deeds condemned by the law and, in general, quite full of every virtue. So then, of these two, which one will surpass the other and which one will

[203] Cyril entertains the same objection about a different topic at *c. Iul.* 5.17.

[204] On this metaphor, which appears in Cyril's predecessors Melito and Origen as well as in Cyril's other works, see Boulnois, SC 624, 611–13; Zaganas 2019, 102–07.

walk away with the winning verdict, crowned with votes of approval from above? I think it is only reasonable that the second one would.

9.28 But if Julian thinks and claims that I have misrepresented the situation, he ought to know that he is opposing his own forebears and is attempting to corrupt what they deemed worthy of complete admiration. For example, Porphyry, following the opinions of the ancients,[205] says the following at one point:

> Hence it is necessary for us to purify our character and then proceed to sacrifice, offering sacrifices to God[206] that are dear to him but not expen-
> [646] sive. These days people suppose that putting on splendid clothing […][207] is insufficient for the purity needed for sacrifices but they suppose that, when they come to the sacrifices, it makes no difference whether they have made the body resplendent with clothing or[208] have a soul cleansed of vices, as if God did not take delight in that most divine part of us when it is in a state of purity, since it has a natural relation to him. For example, there is an inscription at Epidaurus:
>
> Pure one must be to enter within the temple filled with incense.
> And purity is the thinking of holy thoughts.[209]

So you can see that he says purity in one's habits is above all most dear to the all-holy God. He confirms this in another passage too. For he again said,

> For given that the sandals on our feet must be clean and spotless in the sanctuaries people have set apart for the gods, when it comes to the temple of our father, which is this universe, is it not proper to keep holy our last external garment, which is this tunic of skin,[210] and to live with it holy in the temple of the father? For if the risk lay in defiling it alone, one could

[205] Since Porphyry had cited ancient authorities in the passage just before the one quoted here, Boulnois (SC 624, 514 n. 1) rightly remarks that Cyril must have known the larger context from which he took this quotation.

[206] Cyril's text here has the singular τῷ θεῷ ("to God") while Porphyry had the plural τοῖς θεοῖς ("to the gods"). The later reference to the divine in this fragment is, however, singular in both Porphyry and Cyril.

[207] Cyril has omitted the phrase περὶ σῶμα μὴ καθαρόν ("around the unclean body").

[208] Cyril's version of this passage has ἤ in place of the μή that occurs in the manuscripts of Porphyry's work, so instead of "*or* a soul cleansed of vices," Porphyry's text originally read "but with their soul *not* cleansed of vices."

[209] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.19.4–5 (possibly drawing on Theophrastus' *On Piety*). Cyril seems to be the only ancient author to cite this passage, implying he read Porphyry's work himself. The inscription from Epidaurus was also quoted by Clement, *Str.* 5.1.13.3. It once stood above the entrance to the sanctuary of Asclepius.

[210] The "tunic of skin" (χιτῶνα τὸν δερμάτινον) seems to make allusion to Gen 3:21 (χιτῶνας δερματίνους); see Bouffartigue and Patillon 1977, 37–41, for other ancient sources that allegorically equated the "tunics of skin" with the body as a covering for the soul.

> disregard this and not take it seriously, but, as it is, since the entire sensible body carries effluences from material daemons, the impurity arising from flesh and blood exists together with this power that is its friend and companion due to their similarity and kinship.[211] [647]

And again:

> I do not think anyone will object if I shed light on the present topic by setting forth for those with clever minds the ideas some of the Platonists have made public. They say the following: that the first God, being incorporeal, unmoved, and indivisible, neither contained in anything nor bound to himself, needs nothing external, as has been said. […] As for the remaining gods, the universe and the fixed stars and planets – visible gods composed of soul and body – they must be thanked in the aforementioned manner, with inanimate sacrifices.[212]

9.29 Hence, given that the incorporeal God stands in need of nothing at all external to himself, and given that approaching him through blood has been discredited even among those who were Julian's instructors, why then does he bring an accusation and indictment against those who know how to sacrifice in a manner that is in tune with God? For it has been written, "Honor the Lord from your righteous labors and offer to him the first portion from the fruits of your justice."[213] And the divine David also said, "Make justice your sacrifice and put your hope in the Lord."[214] And again, "I went around and offered in his tent a sacrifice of praise and acclamation."[215]

Moreover, the lawgiver himself will confirm for you that, when the resplendence of good deeds is not present in people, the power of blood sacrifice is entirely useless; for he says to the prophet Jeremiah when Israel [648] had stumbled, "And you shall not pray on behalf of this people for their good, because, if they fast, I will not hear their petition, and, if they offer whole burnt offerings and sacrifices, I will take no delight in them."[216] And again, "Upon whom will I look except upon the one who is gentle and quiet and who trembles at my words? But the lawless who sacrifices to me a calf is like one who kills a dog, and the one who offers fine wheat flour is like one who offers the blood of swine."[217] And indeed the most

[211] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.46.1–47.1.
[212] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.36.6–37.1; 37.3. Cyril has omitted a sentence in the middle of this extract describing the World Soul.
[213] Prov 3:9. [214] Ps 4:6.
[215] Ps 26(27):6. These two verses from the psalter are also cited together back to back in Cyril, *Ps.* 49:5 (PG 69.1080cd).
[216] Jer 14:11–12. [217] Isa 66:2–3.

miserable Job[218] says, "For the Lord shall not reject the innocent person but he will accept no gift from the impious."[219] And at one point another wise man also said, "The sacrifice of the unrighteous is a reproachable offering."[220] And again, "The Most High is not pleased with the offerings of the impious."[221]

For in fact, maintaining a reverent life and being prepared to exercise each and every virtue, in addition to inclining towards better things and trying to avoid what is worse – all of this would be a kind of sacrifice to the all-holy God, one bearing the sweetest fragrance, just as the blessed David says, "It will be pleasing to God more than a young calf bearing horns and hoofs."[222] And the all-wise Paul incites us towards this goal by
[649] saying, "I therefore exhort you: present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God, which is your rational service."[223] Therefore, it is not in fact because Israel has stopped sacrificing that we have abstained from sacrificing; rather, even if they were to sacrifice, and even if they should choose to fulfil the divine decrees given to the ancients in shadows, we ourselves will proceed along the highway and come directly to what is reasonable, successfully reaching our destination of the intellectual worship in the Spirit.

9.30 But since Julian says the reason Israel has ceased performing the religious duties prescribed in the law is that they are unable to do so as long as they are excluded from Jerusalem, he will have to learn from us the divine purpose[224] for which this has come to pass.[225] For why, someone might say, did he command that these rites be performed for him not in all the earth under heaven or even wherever they happened to be while they remained yoked to the law, but instead in Jerusalem alone, as if there was something significant and essential about this place? Was it because the God over all exists only in this land or does not want to be honored everywhere? No one would doubt that the first option is completely nonsensical. For the divine is unbounded and the incorporeal does not exist in a particular place, but it extends everywhere, and everything is full of it.[226] And, to take the other option, the claim that he does

[218] This superlative epithet for Job (τληπαθέστατος) is used only by Cyril and by Didymus (?), *Trin.* 3.10 (PG 39.857c), in addition to a few much later Byzantine authors. Cyril uses it several times: *Glaph. Gen.* 2 (PG 69.93a); *Ps.* 38:9; 50:7 (PG 69.977b; 1092a); *Is.* 45:8 (PG 70.960b); *Nest.* 5.5 (ACO 1.1.6, p.102.14).

[219] Job 8:20. [220] Sir 34:21. [221] Sir 34:23. [222] Ps 68(69):32. [223] Rom 12:1.

[224] Gk.: οἰκονομίαν.

[225] On the ensuing discussion of why Israel was limited to sacrificing in Jerusalem, see Boulnois, SC 624, 614–15, who highlights earlier treatments of this question in Origen, Justin Martyr, and Eusebius.

[226] On the issue of incorporeality and place, cf. Porphyry, *Sent.* 1–3; 27.

not want to be honored in every place would expose current practices to a not inconsiderable critique. For he *is* venerated by us everywhere, and, as the prophet says, "His name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to his name and a pure sacrifice."[227] And it is also written about us, "They will venerate the Lord, each from his own place."[228] [650]

Hence, given that God is glorified in every place and does not reject it, but instead even regards negligence in this as a punishable offense, why do the descendants of Israel themselves not seem also to share in the freedom of making the customary dedications to God everywhere, if they should choose to do so? The answer is that with perfect foresight the lawgiver perceived in advance what would come to pass in the future and so issued a command that they must sacrifice in Jerusalem alone, in order that they would be forced to abandon their ancient customs and progress to what is better. For in the future they were going to be sent forth from their country, once they had become Christ-killers, and were to live among the lands of the nations. But it would have been incredible, or rather it would arguably have even been harmful to converts from the nations, if they were to continue sacrificing after they had spread to every place. For if some people called through faith were destined to cease practicing their ancient customs, while others were destined to keep approaching God with blood offerings as though these were most dear to him, the latter group would have harmed to no small degree those who had only recently been caught in the net of the truth and who were receiving instruction in intellectual and immaterial worship by the lessons of the gospel. [651]

9.31 Therefore, since circumstances have been channeled towards the truth and since what was presented in types and riddles has undergone a transformation into something better, we hold that the law has not been abolished,[229] but has instead reached its final goal at that critical moment when the truth (that is, Christ)[230] shone upon us.[231] But if he accuses our position[232] on the grounds that we have given up the types and, having perceived the light of the truth with the acute eyes of our mind, have

[227] Mal 1:11. Cyril's version of this verse alters the order of the clauses and has a few word changes. The only other ancient author to cite this exact version is Ps-Gregory of Nyssa, *Test.* 16 Albl (PG 46.228a).

[228] Zeph 2:11. [229] The language here echoes Matt 5:17. [230] Cf. John 14:6.

[231] The opening sentence of this paragraph (*c. Iul.* 9.31.1–5) also appears verbatim in the catena tradition on Romans, where it is joined with two other passages from *c. Iul.* (9.40.8–16; 10.35.36–44). See *Rom.* 10:4 (235.20–24 Pusey).

[232] Gk.: τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς.

opted to carry out a way of life not practiced by the Jews (since we place great value upon the spiritual worship), he ought also to rebuke the other domains of knowledge[233] and those eager to go through them, since those who move on from introductory lessons for beginners do so because they have focused all their attention upon becoming excellent in what they are studying. In the crafts of the artisans too you may see how great the progress leading to improvement has been, but no one indicts them for this! The first craftsmen, using a different method [to the one used later], used to draw pictures on boards, but those who came after them, with a skill surpassing their predecessors, began to mold statues, and the earlier craftsmen were never capable of the exceptional precision attained by those who came later. What need is there for me to talk further about the art of weaving or of stonemasonry and the inventions of those craftsmen? How could anyone fail to recognize how much more advanced their
[652] current creations are in comparison with the initial stages of these crafts?

If, then, [Julian] still insists that we have degraded the law of the all-wise Moses to a worse condition, let him go ahead and indict us for breaking the law, deliberately scorning the divine precepts, and placing no value upon what is most important of all. But if, on the contrary, we refine the materiality of the shadow found in the law and transpose it into the beauty of the truth, and if what was obscurely announced to the ancients in riddles has now instead obtained a clearer contemplative sense,[234] our opponent deserves to hear this response from us: "Do not be a lover of fault-finding, since it is irksome, nor be censorious, since it is exasperating."[235]

Nevertheless, his argument against us does not stop here.[236] Striving left and right to align the customs of the Greeks with those of the Jews (except, he says, in one respect since the Jews worship one God alone while the Greeks say there are many gods as well), he imagines that our customs diverge from the views of both groups, since we neither accept that there are many gods nor indeed one in accordance with the law, but instead confess three gods in place of one. Perhaps he imagined that the holy and consubstantial Trinity or the nature of the single divinity has been severed by us into three gods. But our valiant argument has, I think,

[233] Gk.: ταῖς ἑτέραις τῶν ἐπιστημῶν, referring to other intellectual or academic subjects.

[234] Gk.: ἐκφανεστέραν … τὴν θεωρίαν.

[235] Isocrates, *Or.* 1 (*Ad Demonicum*), 31. According to Boulnois (SC 624, 172–73), Cyril is the only one to quote this line of the Isocratean speech, although surviving papyri attest it to be the most popular of his orations.

[236] This and the next few sentences (*c. Iul.* 9.31.29–38) are included by Masaracchia as *c. Gal.* fr. 73, though they seem rather to be Cyril's allusion to fr. 72 cited above in *c. Iul.* 9.22. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 530 n. 2.

already shown[237] that, by lodging in our heart and mind the correct and entirely blameless view on this topic, we have been set free from the silliness existing among them both and indeed we even hasten to pursue, without any deviation, the aim[238] of the sacred writings. [653]

9.32 It is reasonable for me now to mention the further accusations Julian makes in addition to those already discussed. For on these topics he once again says,

Julian

> *Why, when it comes to diet, are you not clean like the Jews, but claim that we ought to eat "everything just like the vegetable of the field,"*[239] *putting your faith in Peter because – so [Peter] claims – that [voice]*[240] *said, "What God has made clean, do not make common"?*[241] *What is your evidence for this assertion that God long ago regarded certain things as defiled but now has made them clean?*[242] *For Moses, when he was laying down distinctions about four-footed creatures, says every one that "divides the hoof" and "chews the cud" is clean and the ones not like this are unclean.*[243] *Therefore, if, following Peter's vision, swine have now obtained the ability to chew the cud, we ought to be persuaded by him, since it would be truly miraculous if, after Peter's vision, they obtained this ability. But if that man was lying when he said he saw in the tanner's workshop this "revelation" (to use your way of putting it),*[244] *why would we be*

[237] Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.35–49; 4.44; 8.26–33. [238] Gk.: σκοποῦ.

[239] Gen 9:3. Julian likewise alludes to this verse in his *c. Cyn.* 12.192d.

[240] The subject of φησίν ("he claims") is unspecified and the subject of εἶπεν ("he/it said") is ἐκεῖνος ("that one"). We follow Boulnois (SC 624, 533 n. 4) in seeing "Peter" as the subject of φησίν, and the voice from heaven as the reference of ἐκεῖνος, with this being an allusion to Peter's recounting of his vision in Acts 11:9. It is, however, also possible that the φησίν is another instance of the pattern of this verb being used in the fragments of *c. Gal.* with an unspecified, ambiguous subject. See the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).

[241] Acts 10:15. Early in his treatise, Julian asserted that Christians had taken from the Greeks "a debased and lax manner of life" (*c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.9]), and Cyril took this to be a reference to Christians' libertinism with respect to diet (*c. Iul.* 2.12). Cyril perhaps had in mind *c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 7.28], where Julian had claimed Christians had adopted Greek dietary practices and had cited Gen 9:3, as he does here. Julian elsewhere endorsed dietary restrictions as a means of piety in *ad deor. matr.* 14.174a–18.178a. Traditional dietary customs were also discussed by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 5.34).

[242] As highlighted by Boulnois (SC 624, 533 n. 5), Origen had previously discussed Jewish dietary laws at *Cels.* 2.1; 5.49, mentioning Peter's vision in Acts, so it is possible that Julian is here responding to him.

[243] Cf. Lev 11:1–8; Deut 14:3–8.

[244] This comment presumably refers to the term ἀποκάλυψις, which is not the word used in Acts 10–11 to refer to Peter's vision (ὅραμα) but was a common term in Christian parlance for such divine revelations. The word lacks a classical Greek pedigree, which must be the point of Julian's remark. Its earliest frequent appearance is in the LXX and the New Testament, and later Christian texts likewise made abundant usage of it; see Boulnois SC 624, 534 n. 2. The word does not occur in the rest of Julian's surviving corpus.

so quick to believe him in such important matters? For what did he impose upon you that was so difficult, when, in addition to swine, he forbade you from eating winged things and sea creatures, declaring that these animals too,
[654] *in addition to swine, have been excluded by God and shown to be unclean?*[245]

Cyril

9.33 Tell me then, are you so amazed at the customs of the Jews and are you saying that their practice of dietary regulations is clean and that Christians are inferior to the Jews' healthy dietary regime?[246] Well, let us consider, if it pleases you, from what kind of delicacies the law of the all-wise Moses drove them away and what he commanded them to regard as edible. It has been written in Leviticus, "And the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron saying, 'Speak to the sons of Israel saying, "These are the animals you shall eat from all the animals on the earth: every animal that divides the hoof and splits the two parts of the hoof and brings up the cud among the animals, these you shall eat. However, among those that bring up the cud and among those that divide the hooves and among those that split the hooves you shall not eat from these: you shall not eat the camel, because this animal brings up the cud but does not split the hoof – this one is unclean for you; and the hare and the coney and the pig, because this animal splits the hoof and divides the parts of the hoof and does not bring up the cud – this one is unclean for you."'"[247]

This is what he said about those animals. Shifting his discussion to genera and species of marine animals and of winged animals and indeed of some other kinds as well, he once again says the following: "And these
[655] animals you shall eat from those in the water: everything whatsoever that has fins and scales in the water and in the seas and in the streams, these you shall eat. And everything whatsoever that does not have fins or scales is an abomination for you and shall be abominable to you."[248] And further on: "And these you shall regard as abominable among the birds, and they shall not be eaten: the eagle, the bearded vulture, the osprey, the

[245] *c. Gal.* fr. 74 Mas.; Wright 1923, 406–09.

[246] The Greek for "healthy dietary regime" is εὐσιτίας, a very rare word that only occurs once prior to Cyril, in a medical text (cf. Aretaeus, *De causis et signis diuturnorum morborum libri duo* 1.16.2). Cyril uses the term again at *c. Iul.* 9.34.2.

[247] Lev 11:1–7. Cyril has shortened the passage by combining the prescriptions concerning the hare, the coney, and the pig into a single statement.

[248] Lev 11:9–11. As in the last quotation from Leviticus, Cyril has condensed the passage by omitting some of its repetitive phrases.

vulture and kite and those like it, and a sparrow and a sea gull and a raven and those like it, and a falcon and those like it, and a long-eared owl and a cormorant and an ibis and a water-hen and a pelican and a swan and a little owl and a heron and water plover."[249] And once more after other words: "And these will be unclean for you from the creeping things that creep upon the earth: the weasel and the mouse and the dry-land crocodile, the field mouse and chameleon and gecko and lizard and mole rat."[250]

9.34 How utterly amazing is the cleanliness of the Jews and indeed also their healthy dietary regime! For they regard as inedible the camel, the coney, the eagle, the bearded vulture, the cormorant, the hoopoe, and the [656]
little owl, and, in addition, they repudiate ravens, ibises, and bats, along with a heron, the timid mouse, a weasel, a field mouse, a gecko, and a mole rat. Is there any such excellent food they have not set aside as worthless in their reverence for the law? O how virtuous of them![251] It seems they don't even think twice about overruling their stomach and giving up such fine dining in exchange for miserable fare[252] to avoid offending the lawgiver! On the other hand, it would be reasonable and just to censure the practices of the Christians![253] For, as though they were bidding farewell to the law, they have decided to abstain from none of the aforementioned animals; rather for them "*everything*" is edible, "*just like the vegetable of the field*,"[254] and the prized dishes on their tables are ravens and ibises and the rest!

We should, therefore, praise the law, because in legislating such excellent guidelines for a fastidious diet for the people of Israel, it bade them keep away from things that no one values anyway, but indeed are so detestable to all humanity that even the mere sight of them is something utterly abhorrent. "But," Julian says, "it is true that everyone would regard *those* animals as shameful and despicable, and quite rightly so. However, it is still possible to praise those who live under the law and to marvel at their self-control. For they have also abstained from the meat of pigs as well as a great many kinds of other birds and fish, such as the

[249] Lev 11:13–19. [250] Lev 11:29–30.

[251] As observed by Boulnois (SC 624, 538 n. 1), in mocking Julian's admiration for Jewish dietary laws Cyril is here adopting a rhetorical strategy earlier used by Julian to critique Christians' esteem for the Decalogue (*c. Gal.* fr. 29 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 5.2]).

[252] The Greek word here is κακοσιτίαν, the opposite of the concept of εὐσιτία mentioned in *c. Iul.* 9.33.2–3; 9.34.2. Like that earlier word, κακοσιτία is also very rare, occurring only a handful of times, primarily in medical texts. Cf. Aretaeus, *De causis et signis diuturnorum morborum libri duo* 2.6.1; 2.6.8; Oribasius, *Collectiones medicae* 8.23.3.

[253] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν. [254] Cf. Gen 9:3.

sparrow and fish lacking scales and fins. For the law proscribed viewing these animals as edible." If, therefore, on the one hand [the lawgiver] knows that [such animals] are good, then eating these numerous [animals] that are more delectable would be natural – and if among gastronomists they are not in fact viewed as more delectable than all the other animals, then let them receive a more shameful verdict along with the others![255] But if, on the other hand, although they are good for being
[657] used as food, they have nevertheless been declared by the law to be invalid, then let us investigate[256] the reasons the [lawgiver] condemned foods that are not actually shameful.

9.35 So then, [the law] regards the pig as despicable because, [Julian] says, it splits the parts of the hoof and does not bring up the cud. But, besides the pig, [the law] has censured some of the marine animals too, since they have neither scales nor indeed protruding fins. Are, then, the intrinsic natural features of the aforementioned animals sufficient to force [the law] to bring this reproach against them? Why does it matter at all whether the pig does in fact divide the hoof into two parts yet fails to chew the cud? Why does it matter if some of those animals who customarily live in water lack fins and indeed also scales? Did, then, the law make an incorrect statement and randomly denounce some things as impure that were not actually shameful? We are not claiming this. For [the law] provides no small amount of benefit to those who are able to perceive, by subtle reflection, the profundity of the ideas hidden within it.

For since the aim[257] of the lawgiver was to introduce those undergoing instruction to the topic of who, more than anyone else in the world, they ought to associate with and whom they should avoid, he employs each of the aforementioned animals as an illustration of people similar to it, in terms, I mean, of the quality of their morals.[258] I will now make clear the meaning of these ideas. He proscribes the use of the camel and the pig for food, the former because it chews the cud but does not split its foot into a divided hoof, and the latter because it cleaves the hoof into two

[255] The present sentence is perhaps the most difficult one in all of *c. Iul.* to interpret. It presents a number of vexing questions, which are lucidly and briefly summarized in Boulnois, SC 624, 540 n. 3. We take the subject of the verb οἶδεν ("he knows") to be νομοθέτης ("the lawgiver"), based on the close parallel at *c. Iul.* 9.38.16–17. The rationale for this passage is similar to that stated in *c. Iul.* 7.34.18–31, specifically the role played in the argument by the concept of "nature."

[256] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν.

[257] Gk.: σκοπός.

[258] Cyril's interpretation of the animals named by Leviticus as exemplifying certain human traits is in keeping with a common exegetical tradition among early Christian interpreters, which goes back at least to Philo of Alexandria. Cf. Philo, *Spec.* 4.106–18; *Ep. Arist.* 139–69; *Barn.* 10; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.8.4; Clement, *Paed.* 3.11.75–76; *Str.* 5.8.51.1–5.8.52.3. Cyril explores these and other moralizing animal analogies at greater length in *Ador.* 14 (PG 68.913–37).

parts but it obviously does not chew the cud. Indeed, one could say each of them has something the other lacks. For the pig, as I said, parts the hoof but does not chew the cud, and the inverse is true for the camel. So then, did the law calculate their degree of offensiveness in relation to one another, so that they are bad and profane by half? Yet how is this true? If it pleases you, dear sir, let us discern what is at stake here, what riddle is present. [658]

9.36 The God-breathed scripture customarily takes the stepping of the foot and sometimes the whole foot itself as a riddling indication of the path formed by each deed someone performs, such as the passage in the book of *Proverbs*, "Make straight tracks with your feet and straighten your paths."[259] And indeed also through the voice of David, "And I turned my feet towards your testimonies."[260] Observe, therefore, how the foot is taken to be a type of the path formed by each deed someone performs. And in our experience this path is, in a way, twofold: for either we become accustomed to benefit ourselves by acts of virtue, always gaining something better, and we obtain pure knowledge, hiding it away in the treasuries of our heart; or we direct our zeal in these matters towards other people as well, as a gift, proceeding through many methods. Therefore, the duality in the stepping of the foot would signify the ability to walk in both these directions.

As for the chewing of the cud, it would be a symbol of the capacity for rational thought. For, in my view, I would say that those who would be revered and would attain wisdom and would investigate true doctrines [659] must, not once, but many times turn over and over the ideas relevant to each problem, and, as it were, extensively chew them again and, as it were, press on by increasing precision to refine those objects of contemplative knowledge that are hard to understand.[261] For in fact something simply accepted without examination and without being thrashed out through inquiries can sometimes even prove to be harmful. Hence, the law pronounces as invalid the person who knows how to benefit himself and others in practical terms yet does not have the ability to reason in addition to this. And, conversely, [the law] declares impure the person who, despite being an especially dear friend of reason, is not consistently

[259] Prov 4:26. [260] Ps 118(119):59.

[261] Cyril here seemingly describes the method he employed in the *Thesaurus*, one of his earliest works, which is devoted to setting forth the Nicene account of the doctrine of the Trinity against the objections of the "Arians" and Eunomius. The work is almost scholastic in nature, treating a series of questions raised by his opponents, with multiple arguments and responses compiled under each, often in syllogistic form.

distinguished in their actions as well. For the Savior says, "Whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven."[262] For anyone who is intending to make their highest priority the attainment of the requisite admiration must be skilled at both.

9.37 Moreover, the animals living in the water that grow neither scales nor fins always, in a sense, love to wallow in the mud at the bottom, hate to swim to the surface, and are sluggish with poor mobility. And these animals too would be types of those people who roll around in the muck of licentiousness and are buried in the mud of hedonism and are accustomed to do everything, so to speak, in nakedness and without any
[660] clothes. For this is what would be intimated to us by those animals the law finds fault with for not having scales and natural coverings.

As for the fact that they are also without fins, this again intimates that they are not well prepared with the will required to swim to the surface and that they only barely emerge from the vices in which they live. These people are corrupt, desperate, and enslaved by the pleasures of the belly, and, as I said, they are well acquainted with fornication and licentiousness, being effeminate and profane, the types of womanish people who are despicable to everyone and carry the indelible stain left by all their shameful actions. [The lawgiver] desires that those who revere him have nothing whatsoever to do with people accustomed to live in this manner, nor indeed with other people too whose entire life is spent in greed and avarice and an inordinate love of gain, who are signified exceedingly well by eagles and falcons, as well as cormorants, bearded vultures, and vultures.

Furthermore, the raven and the animals like it are likewise types of people who live in trickery, while a hoopoe, an owl, as well as a bat, and, in addition, all those that fly at night in the dark, are types of people who live in ignorance and, as it were, in darkness and night, who abhor the light of understanding. A weasel and a mouse to a certain degree depict in themselves the cowardly and unmanly class of thieves who are frightened at the drop of a pin. So, to sum up, it would not be difficult to connect true and cogent rationales[263] to each of the animals mentioned in
[661] the law, since "the law is spiritual"[264] and it does not restrict the interpretation of its ideas to its more overt meaning.

9.38 Hence[265] when the divine Peter wanted to continue lingering in the Jews' customs and, as it were, hesitated to proceed to what was better,

[262] Matt 5:19. [263] Greek: λόγους. [264] Rom 7:14.
[265] This entire section (*c. Iul.* 9.38) was excerpted and included in the catena tradition on Acts. Cf. Cramer 1844, III: 179.14–34.

since he was terribly overcome by regard for the types, God lowered down from heaven the sheet with those animals depicted in it that, as I said, used to be condemned by the law's verdicts as profane, albeit in a riddling manner. And God actually ordered him to slaughter them and, if he so chose, to take them for food. At this the disciple became so distraught that he even spoke like a Jew, saying, "By no means, Lord, for I have never eaten anything common or unclean. Nor has there entered into my mouth any profane meat."[266] Then a voice came in response, with God all but rebuking him and clearly saying, "What God has made clean, do not make common."[267] He then immediately understood that the time had come when the shadows must be transfigured into the truth.

So the transition of the types into the truth completely fulfills them instead of showing that the laws were baseless, as some think. Therefore, it is not the case that at one time the lawgiver came to realize the pig and the other animals were clean and at another time was unaware of this fact; rather, he knew they were well made, since it has been written, "And [662] God saw everything that he made, and behold everything was very good, and he blessed it."[268] For in terms of what each created thing is by nature and has been created to be, it will invariably possess in and of itself the property of being good.[269] Therefore, even if the attribute of chewing the cud happens not to be present in pigs, it nevertheless is not an unclean animal, but instead is edible. And there is no way it will bring defilement upon people, insofar as its own nature is concerned. For, as I said, the law consists of types and has shadows "covering it until the time for its revision."[270] This is what the most holy Paul has written to certain people.

9.39 Nevertheless, Julian probably imagined we were delirious in thinking and speaking these things. And, being yet again self-absorbed, he ignorantly dives into the sacred writings and says,

Julian

> *But why am I going on at length about these sayings of theirs? We can easily see if they have any force. For they say that, after the earlier law, God instituted a second one, since the former one was created for a specific occasion and*

[266] Acts 10:14. Cyril's quotation is a conflation of this verse with Acts 11:8 and a phrase from Ezek 4:14. He also cites this form of the passage at *Os.* 1:3 (1.16 Pusey); *Ador.* 14 (PG 68.917a).
[267] Acts 10:15. [268] Gen 1:31; the last phrase is taken from Gen 1:22.
[269] The same principle is stated by Augustine at *C. D.* 12.5.
[270] Cf. Heb 9:10. Note that this passage includes the word διόρθωσις ("revision, reformation"), which Julian will also mention in the ensuing fragment.

restricted by a limited time period, while the latter one has appeared on
[663] *account of the fact that Moses' law was restricted in terms of time and place.*[271] *That this saying of theirs is a lie I will clearly demonstrate from Moses, presenting not just ten but ten thousand pieces of testimony where he says the law is eternal. Listen now to this passage from the book of Exodus: "And this day shall be a memorial for you, and you shall celebrate it as a feast to the Lord throughout your generations. You shall celebrate it as an eternal precept. For seven days you shall eat unleavened bread, from the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses."*[272]

And after piling up other quotations on top of this one and pointing out that all of those he cites call the law eternal (for I think I need to rescue our discourse from going around and around in circles), he again adds:

Although there are many more such passages that I have passed over in which Moses' law <is said>[273] *to be eternal, I have refrained from citing them because there are so many. But as for you, show me where Moses said that which Paul later boldly asserted – "Christ is the fulfillment of the law."*[274] *Where did God promise the Hebrews another law besides the one established? Nowhere! Nor did he promise a revision of the established law.*[275] *For listen again to Moses: "You shall not add to the word that I am commanding you, and you shall not take away from it. You shall keep the commandments of the Lord your God that I am commanding you today," and "Everyone who does not hold fast to all of them shall be accursed."*[276] *But you supposed that*
[664] *it was a trifling matter to take away from or to add to what is written in the law, and that it was more manly and more noble to transgress it completely, since your gaze is fixed, not upon the truth, but upon what will persuade everyone.*[277]

[271] As noted by Boulnois (SC 624, 556 n. 2), Origen had made mention of a "second law" in *Cels*. 2.75. However, this sentence also presents parallels with Eusebius, *D.e*. 1.2–3, leading Bouffartigue 1992, 387 to conclude that Julian was responding to Eusebius.

[272] Exod 12:14–15.

[273] The GCS editors suspect a lacuna here in light of the fact that the relative clause beginning with ἀφ' ὧν lacks a verb but has a noun and adjective in *oratio obliqua*. The GCS edition does not supply a conjectural emendation, but instead simply marks a gap in the text. Oecolampadius has *dicitur*, which we follow.

[274] Rom 10:4.

[275] In a footnote in her Loeb translation of this passage, Wright highlighted as relevant Julian's comment at *ad deor. matr.* 10.170a: "But let no one suppose my meaning to be that this was ever done or happened in a way that implies that the gods themselves are ignorant of what they intend to do, or that they have to correct their own errors" (LCL 13.474–75). This statement implies that, if the god of Moses did indeed issue a law, as Julian concedes, then it would have been irreformable, since the gods do not err and know the future.

[276] Deut 4:2; 27:26. The second verse is cited in the form that appears in Gal 3:10.

[277] *c. Gal.* fr. 75 Mas.; Wright 1923, 408–11. In the opening passage of *c. Gal.* Julian had likewise asserted that Christians used deceitful means to persuade gullible people (fr. 1 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.2]).

Cyril

9.40 So then, Julian, as I said, imagined that we, despite being ambassadors for the truth, babble away pointlessly, or that, since the law is *not* actually spiritual, we are perhaps even using refined speech[278] in a cunning manner and are trying to redirect the sense of the text to something other than what has actually been written in order to avoid indictment for violating the law. But this is not so. Why? Because in fact we are not foolishly saying the divine law must be altogether rejected as though it had nothing that contributes to our benefit; rather, we are saying that this law was introduced in advance to be a guide for the ancients to the mystery of Christ and that it gave them a glimpse of the truth through riddles. For this is what we mean when we say Christ is the fulfillment of the law and the prophets, and how right we are! For wouldn't it be reasonable to regard the truth as the fulfillment of every ambiguous riddle?[279] How could anyone doubt this?! Therefore, the transition of what was in shadows into the truth does not entail the destruction of the laws that came through Moses but instead makes his meaning more manifest.[280] This, therefore, is the sense in which we say the law has been called eternal, since it will hardly have ceased when it is being fulfilled [665] through "*the methods*"[281] of our intellectual worship. For Christ arrived not that he might "abolish the law or the prophets" but instead to completely fulfil them, as he himself said.[282]

And I must now say something to make my case clearer, as I said, by way of giving an interpretation of the law at hand, the one cited by him. It has been written about the feast of unleavened bread, "And this day shall be a memorial for you, and you shall celebrate it as a feast to the Lord throughout your generations. You shall celebrate it as an eternal precept. For seven days you shall eat unleavened bread."[283] These are the precepts that God was legislating through Moses. Yet through the voice of Isaiah he argues with those descended from Israel and says, "Your new moons and your Sabbaths […] and your feasts my soul hates. You have

[278] Gk.: κομψοεπείαις, the same word used in *c. Iul.* 3.3.8 and 3.5.3 to refer to pagan views of the literary quality of the Greek poets.

[279] The unstated premise in the argument of the last two sentences is that Christ is the truth (cf. John 14:6), an identification Cyril frequently makes.

[280] The preceding section of this paragraph, beginning with "rather we are saying" (*c. Iul.* 9.40.8–16), also appears verbatim in the catena tradition on Romans, where it is joined with two other passages from *c. Iul.* (9.31.1–5; 10.35.36–44). See *Rom.* 10:4 (235.11–19 Pusey).

[281] Gk.: τοὺς τρόπους, probably recalling Julian's earlier reference to the "methods of sacrifices" at *c. Gal.* fr. 71.2 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.21.11).

[282] Matt 5:17. [283] Exod 12:14–15.

made me full."[284] Tell me then, how could the feasts that were abhorrent to God be perpetual and unending? Should we then say that God changed his mind and, through the prophets, made a mockery of what was instituted through Moses and originally thought to be good? And that he fell short of what was required and suffered from one of the passions we experience? For when someone chooses to hate something that he would otherwise praise, he is tainted with blame for being flippant.

9.41 What then shall we say to release God from these criticisms? He
[666] was right to have passed laws through the all-wise Moses requiring them to fulfil the festivals in types, but he hates the idea that such festivals would be prolonged into the future, since the tendency to be bound up in the types was not beneficial for those who lived in earlier times, and he was intending instead that, by rushing from type and shadow to the beauty of the truth, they might attain the worship that was most delightful to him, and clearly that is the intellectual worship in the Spirit. For example, he commanded them to bake bread when they celebrated the feast, but without using leaven. The Jews thought they were completely fulfilling the law by doing this and nothing more. If so, what sort of benefit came to them from this practice? In what sense would God have taken pleasure in it? You will say that it was of course necessary for them to celebrate the festival in a state of purification. Yet, if the leaven was able to defile those who ate it, why was it not incumbent upon them to forswear it altogether and not merely for seven days, if indeed some of them, being especially devoted to God, were practitioners of the way of life that brings him delight? But, as I already said above, in this law – as doubtless in the others too – an indication of the intelligible reality has been introduced in riddles for those who, by a sharp and purified mind, are able to perceive such contemplative realities.

On the contrary, then, the law about not using leaven is fulfilled above all by us who have been justified in faith and sanctified in the Spirit and who perform the intelligible worship. According to this particular
[667] method of ours, the God-breathed scripture occasionally prefers to take leaven as a type for vice. Therefore, he commanded that they had to celebrate the feast well-scrubbed and cleansed, getting as far away as possible from all vice, having none of the leaven of fleshly uncleanness and

[284] Isa 1:13–14. The version of this passage quoted by Cyril here, which omits several words at the end of Isa 1:13 and the start of Isa 1:14 (καὶ ἡμέραν μεγάλην οὐκ ἀνέχομαι· νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν καὶ τὰς νουμηνίας ὑμῶν) otherwise only appears in Didymus (?), *Trin.* 1.26.50. Cyril cites the full version above at *c. Iul.* 9.26.23–28.

pointless distractions, I mean those distractions consisting in deeds that bring no benefit. For such a person will prove to be an illustrious guest at the banquet.[285] The divine Paul, for example, writes: "Therefore, let us celebrate the feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of vice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."[286]

9.42 Hence, the law is eternal: in ancient times among the Jews it was presented in riddles but now among us the same law is understood in an intelligible and spiritual sense in accordance with the truth. And while the time before the Savior's sojourn was well suited to riddles, the time that came after it, when the truth shone forth, is the moment for truer realities. For though it was necessary, yes necessary indeed, for Israel to be cared for like a child through the all-wise Moses since it possessed a rather uneducated and childlike mind, it was also necessary that through [668] Christ, the Lord of all, "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" as it is written,[287] the true and most perfect knowledge should be introduced to us, not overturning Moses' laws[288] but instead transferring them to clearer conceptions of these realities. And, for example, when Moses used to lecture the Jews, he would place a veil upon his face, practically crying out through this very act that the true face of the law was invisible to them.[289]

Now our opponents might say, "If the second state of affairs was more desirable than the first and in fact also better by far, why did the lawgiver not instead declare it to the first group in the beginning?" To respond, I will now bring forward what I have also said frequently: those descended from Israel, who did not yet have a mind secure in the knowledge of God, used to be very easily turned aside from what was most appropriate for them, and they were prone to apostasy from God and never stopped provoking him; for they made the calf and dared to say, "These are your gods, Israel, who led you up from the land of Egypt."[290]

9.43 Therefore, because they had a rather ignorant heart that was easily led astray, an obscure law was given to them in the form of a type, one that was able to draw them up a little way towards ideas of truer realities but did not yet bring forth the path of the pure way of life for all to see. And the statement made by God through the voice of Isaiah would teach anyone that he was issuing for Israel a literal form [669]

[285] Gk.: θιασώτης (a term taken in the classical period and beyond for a "reveler" in a Bacchic fraternity).
[286] 1 Cor 5:8. See Cyril's similar interpretation of "leaven" at *Ep. Fest.* 19.2 (PG 77.824cd); *Ador.* 12 (PG 68.836ab).
[287] Col 2:3. [288] Gk.: τὰ Μωσέως. [289] Cf. Exod 34:33; 2 Cor 3:12–18. [290] Exod 32:4.

of the law presented in shadows[291] since they were still young children, seeing as how they stumbled and were foolish and unable to walk correctly: "And I raised up my hand against them in the wilderness to scatter them in the countries because they did not perform my ordinances and repudiated my commandments and were profaning my Sabbaths and their eyes were after their fathers' ways of thinking. And it was I who gave them commands that were not good and ordinances by which they shall not live."[292] For when it comes to those who had bolted away from affection towards God and had been caught in the crimes of calf-making (for this, I think, is indicated by the phrase "they have eyes after their fathers' ways of thinking"), for such people it was necessary, necessary indeed, that they should slip away from intimacy with God entirely and wander "in the countries of the nations," entirely deprived of his care.

9.44 Now since he is good and used to honor the supplication of the all-wise Moses, he was giving them legal customs that could function pedagogically, though they were "not good," as he himself says,[293] nor were they able to instill life in those who kept them. Now in what manner were the legal customs "not good"? I maintain that they were "not good" with respect to the beauty of the truth.[294] For the truth is incomparably more excellent than riddles. Even if it is correct that those descended from Israel derived no benefit at all from the requirement of eating bread that was not leavened, nevertheless when it comes to those who have banished the leaven of vice, those who have a heart scrubbed clean and who love nothing defiled or profane, to them God has granted
[670] a destined share in eternal life as their outstanding reward. Moreover, one can observe in Isaiah that it was not possible to attain true well-being through the shadow in the law nor indeed to progress onwards towards God via a straight path; for he speaks to God in the persona of the descendants of Israel: "You, Lord, caused us to wander from your way."[295] And the blessed David says, "And you diverted our paths from your way."[296] For, as I said, the type was not a clear and easily traveled path carrying one to God, although, dear sir, it did have sketched within it the truth.

[291] Gk.: τὸν ἐν σκιαῖς καὶ γράμμασι νόμον.
[292] Ezek 20:23–25. Cyril misattributes this passage from Ezekiel to Isaiah. Origen had cited it in *Cels.* 7.20 with a similar intent of showing that the literal sense of the law was "not good."
[293] Ezek 20:25.
[294] The words for "good" (καλά) and "beauty" (κάλλος) in this sentence are cognates in Greek.
[295] Isa 63:17. [296] Ps 43(44):19.

9.45 Furthermore, since that accuser of the sacred scriptures says the God of the universe nowhere promised to give "*another law*" to the descendants of Israel nor indeed did he institute some kind of "*revision*" of the legislation that came through Moses,[297] I will attempt to show that he is lying with respect to both points, adducing the prophet's saying which reads as follows: "Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will execute a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not like the covenant that I arranged with their fathers in the day when I took them by their hand to lead them out from the land of Egypt, because they did not persevere in my [671] covenant and I had no concern for them, says the Lord, because this is the covenant that I will arrange with them in those days, says the Lord: placing my laws in their minds, I will also inscribe them on their hearts."[298] It was, I think, because he understood this point so very well that the all-wise Paul wrote to certain individuals and said, "You yourselves are our letter, known and read by all people, showing that you are a letter of Christ resulting from our ministry, which has been written not in ink, but by the Spirit of the living God."[299] For given that God instills within us the knowledge of his own will, and, thanks to this knowledge, even inscribes upon the hearts of believers those things that can make them become supremely venerable, how could the shadow not be useless? And so, the law will not suffer any addition or subtraction but will stay the same, being fulfilled no longer in terms of what is visible on the surface but instead in an intelligible and spiritual sense.

9.46 Now, someone would, so it seems to me, say that this response of ours is also beautifully conceived. Nevertheless – under the effects of who knows what sickness – Julian approves of the traditions of the Jews, but then again rebukes them, since, although attached to all the other [religious customs], *for some totally irrational reason they have scruples about sacrificing, despite the fact that,* he says, *Elijah sacrificed on Carmel*[300] *and* [672] *not in the holy city, meaning of course in Jerusalem*. And I myself would also add the divine David who sacrificed on the threshing floor that was called Araunah, even though the law explicitly says, "Whoever sacrifices a

[297] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 75.19–20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.39.23–25).
[298] Jer 38:31–33. Cyril's version of this passage is in some respects closer to the one in Heb 8:8–10.
[299] 2 Cor 3:2–3.
[300] Cf. 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 18.

calf or a sheep in the camp […] and <does not bring>[301] it to the doors of the tent, […] that soul shall be exterminated from its people."[302]

But, good sir, someone could, in my view, respond by saying, "When Elijah was sacrificing, the temple existed, though it did not yet exist when the divine David did the same. What, then, was there to prevent David from complying with the law and sacrificing in the tent?" Nevertheless, I say the following: behold, yes, behold, how clearly it is demonstrated that even the saints themselves saw nothing wrong with neglecting to focus a most subtle eye on the literal aspects of the law[303] and not being perfectly meticulous in fulfilling them.[304]

9.47 Furthermore, Julian has also mentioned the letter of the holy apostles that they wrote by way of accommodation[305] to those called from the nations, whose minds were all but just beginning to bloom. They said, "*For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than <the following> requirements: you are to abstain from*
[673] *food sacrificed to idols, from sexual immorality, from the meat of a strangled animal, and from blood.*"[306] *So*, Julian says, *in this passage too there is an indication that it did not seem good to the Holy Spirit that Moses' law ought to be undone.* So tell me, did it seem good [to the Holy Spirit] to make them keep [Moses' law] and is this what he commanded?[307]

Yet is it not correct to say that the order he gave those called to the truth through faith was that they must ultimately regard the law's shadow as something of no significance? For through the voice of the holy apostles he was ordaining the sort of laws one would naturally expect those who were still children to be capable of carrying out. So when they said "to lay upon you no greater burden," they were thereby teaching that the

[301] The editors here propose an emendation to complete the sense of the sentence which otherwise would be obscure. They have supplied the words μὴ ἐνέγκῃ, which appear in Cyril's quotation of this passage at *Resp*. 11.

[302] Lev 17:3–4. Cyril's quotation considerably shortens this lengthy passage but keeps the main point. Masaracchia included this paragraph, aside from the first sentence, as *c. Gal.* fr. 76 (= *c. Iul.* 9.46.2–10). It appears to be a description of a portion of *Against the Galileans* that has otherwise been lost. Cf. Boulnois, SC 624, 576 n. 1. On the topic of sacrifice in Jerusalem, cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 72.11–13; 85.25–27 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.22.14–16; 10.31.30–32).

[303] Gk.: τοῖς ἐν γράμμασι νόμοις.

[304] On the Old Testament saints not being overly meticulous in keeping the law, see also *c. Iul.* fr. 39 where Cyril adduces the example of Joshua conquering Jericho on the Sabbath.

[305] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς. In this brief section Cyril claims the apostles acted skillfully by using an "accommodation" or "plan" (οἰκονομία) suited to their audience, which parallels the way he presents the operation of divine action in human history throughout *Against Julian* (e.g., with respect to the institution of Israel's sacrificial system).

[306] Acts 15:28–29. Origen referenced this passage in *Cels*. 8.29.

[307] This paragraph is *c. Gal.* fr. 77 Mas.

law was indeed burdensome and altogether hard to bear even for those from Israel, and that they would not impose it upon them. Therefore, it seemed good to the Spirit that the law should be kept by them only to a very limited degree, and that they should try to fulfill the more bearable parts of the law that are easy to follow, since they were not yet strong enough in mind to endure the sweat required for yet greater regulations, given that their mind was still feeble and had barely gained the strength needed for citizenship and life in Christ.[308]

And in addition to this, that excellent fellow mocks Peter, the most eminent among the holy apostles, and says he was a hypocrite[309] and was rebuked by Paul for being keen to conduct himself on one occasion according to the customs of the Greeks, and on another according to the customs of the Jews,[310] though Julian is completely ignorant of Peter's supremely skillful accommodation[311] on these occasions.[312] For it is not the case that the disciple could not make up his mind, but rather his concern was to employ accommodations[313] appropriate to each occasion and thereby to benefit those who came to him in every way possible. And since the blessed Paul used only a single method for himself, he reminded [Peter of this] when they were together. For he was fearful that some people might be unaware of Peter's policy and could be harmed by his method of accommodation.[314] [674]

[308] This paragraph (*c. Iul.* 9.47.10–21) was excerpted and included in the catena tradition on Acts. Cf. Cramer 1844, 111: 253.8–19.

[309] The same accusation appears in Gal 2:13.

[310] Julian similarly accused the apostle Paul of inconsistency in *c. Gal.* fr. 20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46).

[311] Gk.: εὐτεχνεστάτην οἰκονομίαν.

[312] The first sentence of this paragraph is *c. Gal.* fr. 78 Mas. Cf. Gal 2:11–21. This episode between Peter and Paul was also subjected to criticism by Porphyry and Macarius Magnes' anonymous Hellene. Cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* 1T; 2T; 3T; 4T; 5T Becker; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.22.4. Cyril's appeal to an "accommodation" strategically employed by Peter resonates with the explanation offered by Macarius at *Apocr.* 3.29.6–12. Cf. Cyril's interpretation of this episode in *Rom.* 14:16 (246.5–19 Pusey); Boulnois, SC 624, 615–17.

[313] Gk.: οἰκονομίαις. [314] Gk.: οἰκονομίας.

Book 10

[675] **10.1** We have, I believe, given an account of the shadow in the law that is precise, since the enemy of the truth attempted – I do not know why – to persecute us and bizarrely brings the indictment of lawlessness against people who, more than anyone else, have made a firm determination to fulfill those divine laws in a more rational and precise manner than those who are conversant with the bare types alone. But since he takes us to task for absolutely everything we say and do, observe how he plunges us, so to speak, into yet more accusations, and says we stand in opposition even to the holy mystagogues themselves and have given no regard to the apostolic tradition, but instead have turned wherever our whim might carry us – and what's more, without being taken to task for it! For he
[676] again writes as follows:[1]

Julian

Moreover, you are so ill-fated that you have not even stuck with the teachings handed down to you by the apostles,[2] *but these too have been further developed into something even worse and more impious by those who came later.*[3] *Paul at least did not dare to say Jesus is God, nor did Matthew, or Luke, or Mark, but that good fellow John, because he sensed that a great multitude in*

[1] On *c. Iul.* 10.1–10 and the two fragments of *c. Gal.* it cites (frs. 79–80 Mas.), see Boulnois 2020c, especially 204–12, 219–25. Julian's main focus in these two fragments is critiquing the ascription of deity to Jesus. His contemporary Libanius also highlighted this topic in his brief reference to the work, noting that Julian had "attacked those books that make the man from Palestine God and the child of God" (*Or.* 18.178).

[2] The language seems to allude to Acts 16:4.

[3] This claim picks up and carries forward the narrative of decline running throughout *Against the Galileans*: Christians first abandoned Hellenism for Judaism (*c. Gal.* fr. 3 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.9]), then abandoned Judaism (*c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 7.28]), and finally were unable even to stick to the teachings of the apostles and twisted them into something still worse (*c. Gal.* fr. 79 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 10.1]). Note the use of the verb ἐμμένω in all three fragments, as highlighted by Boulnois 2020c, 197–99. Moreover, the present fragment also picks up the theme of Christian audacity in *c. Gal.* fr. 58 Mas.

many of the Greek and Italian cities had already caught this disease,[4] *and because he heard, I think, that even the tombs of Peter and Paul were being revered – although it was done in secret still he heard about it – he then was the first to dare to say [that Jesus is God].*[5] *And after saying a few things about John the Baptist,*[6] *he returns to the Word he was proclaiming and says, "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us,"*[7] *but he was ashamed to say how this happened, and he nowhere calls him either "Jesus" or "Christ" in the section where he calls him "God" and "Word."*[8] *And, as it were, quietly and surreptitiously stealing our ears, he says John the Baptist gave the following testimony about Jesus Christ, that he is the one whom we must believe to be God the Word.*[9] [677]

Cyril

10.2 Now, tell me, which of the apostolic precepts, whether great or small, have we not kept? What has been corrupted into a worse condition by those who subsequently were entrusted by God with the ministry of the word and did a fine job advocating for[10] the sacred doctrines? For if those intent on unjustifiably railing against people guilty of no improper conduct are to have a license to do so without censure or being held accountable, then let Julian take pride in his attacks on us, since a person who cares so little about appearing scurrilous finds nothing easier than

[4] Julian also calls Christianity a "disease" at *c. Her.* 22.229c; *Ep.* 61c, 98, 111, 114 (pp.75.20–23, 183.4, 188.18, 195.21–24 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 36, 58, 47, 41 [pp.122–23, 206–07, 144–45, 134–35 Wright]).

[5] Cf. John 1:1. Julian's comment assumes the Gospel of John was the last of the four gospels to be written, a widespread tradition going back to Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1, which was mentioned also by Eusebius, *H.e.* 5.8.2–4.

[6] Presumably this is a reference to John 1:6–8, the brief interlude introducing John the Baptist in the midst of John's discussion of the divine Word.

[7] John 1:14.

[8] Julian correctly observes that the words Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ("Jesus Christ") are not used until John 1:17, being absent from the discourse about the divine Word in John 1:1–14.

[9] *c. Gal.* fr. 79 Mas.; Wright 1923, 412–13. The last sentence of the fragment seemingly refers to John 1:15–17, which Julian takes to be the words of John the Baptist (modern translations typically regard only v. 15 as reporting the Baptist's words). On this issue, see Boulnois 2020c, 207–08, and for an earlier debate about the speaker in this passage, cf. Origen, *Jo.* 6.3.13–14. At *c. Gal.* fr. 50 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42) Julian says the evangelist John alone among the disciples said Jesus created the world, and even he did not do so "clearly and unambiguously." Julian continues his critique of John's dissimulation in *c. Gal.* fr. 80 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.8).

[10] With the translation "advocating for" we are following Aubert's conjectural emendation (not adopted by the GCS edition) that συναγηγερκότων be emended to συνηγορευκότων. Two arguments point in this direction. First, when Cyril uses the verb συναγείρω he typically uses it with an accusative, though here we have the dative τοῖς ἱεροῖς δόγμασιν. Second, the emended construction is parallel to the phrase τοῖς ἰδίοις δόγμασι συναγορεύειν at *c. Iul.* 2.7.22; cf. Cyril, *Jo.* 9:34; 14:8 (2.196.25; 2.420.4–5 Pusey). We are grateful to Marie-Odile Boulnois for drawing our attention to this issue.

lying and denouncing others without any grounds for doing so. If, however, he thinks the claims one makes and the people against whom one makes them should be tested,[11] Julian ought not to delight in being unjustifiably censorious but should instead put them to such a test. For it is in this way that his words will gain credibility.

And I am amazed that, even though in many places he analyzes from every angle the passages from the God-breathed scripture in his hunt to acquire a respectable reputation as a lover of learning, he has succeeded in missing the truth and done so completely. For he actually claims that neither "Paul nor Mark nor Matthew nor Luke"[12] say that Christ is God. But those willing to closely examine the statements made about him can see with the utmost clarity that these authors crown him with divine dignities and, whatever qualities would be suitable solely for that supreme nature above all natures, these they everywhere assign to him,
[678] and in fact they do name him "God" as well.[13]

For example, the all-wise Paul says, "For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ on behalf of my brothers, my kindred according to the flesh, who are Israelites and to whom belong the adoption, the giving of the law, the covenant, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs and from them, according to the flesh, is Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever. Amen."[14] What further quotation in addition to this will you need? For behold, yes behold, he says the one who is from the Jews according to the flesh, that is Christ, is also "God over all" and indeed also "blessed forever. Amen." And in another passage he also said, "And those who are in the flesh cannot please God. But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God lives in you. And if someone does not have the Spirit of God, he does not belong to Christ."[15] And once more he says, "I am reminding you on account of the grace given to me by God that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus to the nations with my priestly duty being the gospel of God."[16]

[11] Cyril here continues to use the language of the courtroom (τοὺς ἐλέγχους, and ἐξελεγχέτω later in the sentence), in keeping with Julian's opening forensic framing of his treatise (*c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.7]).

[12] Incidentally, Cyril has switched Julian's order of the evangelists from Matthew, Luke, and Mark at *c. Gal.* fr. 79 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1.17–18) to Mark, Matthew, and Luke; at *c. Iul.* 10.6.11 he will switch the order yet again to Luke, Matthew, and Mark.

[13] As observed by Boulnois 2020c, 219, all of the passages from Matthew and Luke cited by Cyril in *c. Iul.* 10.2–7, as well as all but one of the passages from Paul, also appear in the midst of a larger scriptural florilegium in Cyril, *Arcad.* (ACO 1.1.5, pp.70–94).

[14] Rom 9:3–5. [15] Rom 8:8–9. [16] Rom 15:15–16.

Hence, in light of the fact that those who have been enriched with the Spirit of Christ have a divine Spirit; and that he says he himself has been appointed a priest of Christ among the nations, as though he were a priest of God;[17] and that he calls the message about Christ the "gospel of God"; and that he gives him the name "Lord of glory" (for he says, "If they had known they would not have crucified the Lord of glory")[18] – in light of all this, how can you avoid the obvious conclusion that our opponent has made libelous accusations and would seem to any reasonable person to be himself liable in no small degree to charges of making false statements? [679]

Moreover, although they knew that he is truly God according to nature, the inspired writers had as their aim and goal[19] to name him Son of God and genuine offspring of the substance of the one who engendered him, as one who always coexists and subsists together with his begetter and is understood in the category of the single nature of the divinity, real and with a distinct *hypostasis*.[20] It was for this very reason that the wise John too says the Word existed in the beginning, was God, and was with God, and then, after this, says he also became flesh,[21] that is, became a human. Therefore, the singular aim[22] of the inspired writers – and a not unwise one – was the necessary task of saying he is the Son of God by nature, since this statement invariably and unavoidably entails that the one who is from God with respect to nature is truly God.

10.3 So then, we have now adduced the statements of the divine Paul who clearly and indisputably names Christ, the Savior of the universe, "God." Yet I think it is still necessary for us to bring forward also the passages from the other authors in which they have mentioned Christ as God. So, Matthew said about Joseph, "While he was pondering these things, behold an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, 'Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. She will bear a Son and you are to name him Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins.'"[23] [680]
And [Matthew] also claimed that the admirable John said, "I baptize you with water for repentance but the one who is coming after me is stronger

[17] Cyril is here probably intending to draw attention to the fact that Rom 15:15–16 says that Paul was a minister "of Christ Jesus" (Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) and that he came into this role thanks to grace given to him "by God" (ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ). He seemingly takes this dual ascription of the origin of Paul's ministry to God and to Christ to imply an identification between these two figures.

[18] 1 Cor 2:8. [19] Gk.: σκοπός.

[20] Gk.: ἐνυπόστατον. On this term, see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.28. [21] Cf. John 1:1, 14.

[22] Gk.: σκοπός. [23] Matt 1:20–21.

than me and I am not worthy to carry his sandals; he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand and he will cleanse his threshing floor."[24] And indeed [Matthew] also maintains that at one point the Lord himself says to us, "Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you."[25] And again, when telling us in advance about the end of this age, he said, "Therefore, just as the weeds are gathered and burned in the fire, so it will be at the end of the age. The Son of Man will send his angels."[26]

Well then, Your Excellency, would the ability to set people free from their sins be appropriate to anyone else besides the one who alone is truly God?[27] For those who have issued the laws would have authority over them
[681] and no one else besides them.[28] And how could it also be said that he saves *his* people, when God alone exercises authority over the inhabitants of the earth? Furthermore, I would also point out that the ability to "baptize with the Holy Spirit" those who have believed in him is something that exceeds the limits and grasp of a human, and indeed also that possessing this threshing floor (with the inhabitants of the earth, that is, being understood as harvested wheat) would not be suitable for any human, but would be appropriate to Christ alone. For he was God become flesh (that is, human). And, tell me, whose yoke should the inhabitants of the earth carry? Would it not be reasonable for someone to say that they are yoked to God alone?[29] How then could Christ have commanded us to take upon ourselves the yoke that belonged to him unless he is God and from God according to his nature? And how too could the angels who exist in heaven be his? For he says, "He will send *his* angels."[30]

10.4 So these are the statements Matthew has made for us, though in fact there are a great many other passages I have passed over in silence to avoid giving the impression of crowding my argument with a heap of witnesses beyond what is sufficient. Nonetheless, Mark everywhere runs
[682] through the same ideas and agrees with Matthew's words. For example, he writes, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God."[31] And how could it not be clear to everyone that the one who is truly the Son of God by nature is himself certainly God too? And, to take another example, [Mark] claimed that the Lord said to his holy apostles, "He will

[24] Matt 3:11–12. [25] Matt 11:28–29. [26] Matt 13:40–41. [27] Cf. Mark 2:7 and parallels.

[28] i.e., only those who have issued the laws (literally are the laws' "masters" [κύριοι]) have the authority to grant forgiveness to those who transgress the laws.

[29] Cyril assumes that to be "yoked" to someone means to be under their authority, a metaphor that plays a prominent role in his deconstruction of Hellenic polytheism in book 4. Cf. *c. Iul.* 4.4.5; 4.5.2; 4.26.21–22; 4.41.25; 4.47.27.

[30] Matt 13:41. [31] Mark 1:1.

be given over into the hands of sinful humans and they will mock him and crucify him";[32] and that when the divine Peter nevertheless responded by shouting, "God forbid it, Lord! This shall not happen to you!",[33] Christ then also replied, "Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me because you are setting your mind not on the things of God but on the things of humanity."[34] For Peter did not set his mind on the things of Christ when he spoke in opposition to him. Therefore, [Mark] too named Christ "God," insofar as he said Peter was setting his mind on the things of humanity and not on the things of Christ, as though they were the things of God.[35]

And, again, [Mark] claimed [Jesus] said, "For whoever is ashamed of me and my words, that person the Son of Man will be ashamed of when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."[36] But unless he [683]
was aware that Christ is God, how could he have said he will come in the glory of the Father flanked by holy angels? How could a son of man come in the honor of deity? How could Jesus Christ, that is, the one born from a woman according to the flesh, come in the supreme preeminence that stands over all creation? Therefore, could those who have wholly committed themselves to their ardent love for hunting down the truth possibly doubt that, because [these authors] knew the Lord is truly God, they say that he proudly displays his divine dignities once the appointed time for the economy[37] had passed? And that, during the economy, it was appropriate that, once he had come to possess a likeness to our condition, he did not regard human limitations as something contemptible?

10.5 Furthermore, the fact that the divine Luke also had the same ideas about Christ ought to be clear and very easy [to observe] from what he has written. For he claimed an angel of God said to Zechariah, who was [684]
John's father, "And you will have joy and gladness, and many will rejoice

[32] This quotation does not correspond to any single passage in the gospels but picks up phrases and ideas from several passages such as Luke 24:7; Mark 9:31; 10:33–34. Cyril seemingly has in mind Mark 8:31, a similar prediction of Jesus' future suffering that occurs just prior to the passages he cites next.

[33] Matt 16:22. Mark's version of this episode includes Peter rebuking Jesus (Mark 8:32) but does not report Peter's actual words. Cyril is therefore conflating the Matthean and Markan versions of this pericope.

[34] Matt 16:23. Matthew's version of Jesus' words is almost identical to the Markan version in Mark 8:33, but Cyril is clearly citing the Matthean version.

[35] Cyril's point is that, at the opening of this scene, Christ predicts his own coming suffering and Peter then rejects Christ's prediction, so one would expect him to be rebuked for not setting his mind upon the things of Christ (i.e., the words Christ has just spoken) when instead Peter is condemned for not setting his mind upon the things of God. Therefore, in resisting Christ's words Peter was in fact resisting God, which implies an identification between Christ and God.

[36] Mark 8:38. [37] Gk.: οἰκονομίας.

at his birth," and further on, "And he will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God."[38] Whom, then, was the divine Baptist proclaiming throughout all Judea? Was it not Jesus, whom he pointed to and said, "Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world"?[39] <To whom>[40] was he turning [them] as though to the Lord God? Was it not to him, saying, "I have seen and have testified that this one is the Son of God"?[41]

And indeed [Luke] also says Zechariah himself spoke prophetically about his own child: "And you, child, shall be called a prophet of the Most High, for you will go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins."[42] And once more [Luke] said the holy angel spoke to the holy virgin about Christ: "He will be great and will be called Son of the Most High."[43] Observe, therefore, how John's father prophetically said he will be called "the prophet of the Most High," meaning that Jesus is the Most
[685] High.[44] And the divine angel also named him "Son of the Most High." For the Son who has shone forth from his begetter would naturally be understood to be equal in glory to him, possessing in equal measure absolutely every one of his attributes. For the fact that he became a human for the purpose of the economy[45] does not at all imply that he would be inferior to his Father in any respect; instead the mode of the economy is accounted for on its own terms.[46] But since the Word from God the Father is unchanging and immutable in his nature, he incurs no harm in his own nature from the fact that, for our sakes, he has come to be like us; rather, as Paul says, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever."[47]

[38] Luke 1:14, 16. [39] John 1:29.

[40] The GCS text here reads τίνας ἐπέστρεφεν ("whom was he turning"), making it a question about the object of the turning. However, the logic of this sentence and the next suggests that the rhetorical question should be about the identity of the one *to whom* the people are being turned, not the identity of the people being turned. We, therefore, suggest an emendation of the text to πρὸς τίνα δ', which is reflected in the above translation. See also Cyril's exegesis of this verse in *Pulch.* 121 (ACO 1.1.5, p.92.12–15), where he says John was "turning [the people] as though to God" (ἐπιστρέφων ὡς ἐπὶ θεόν). We are grateful for discussion with Marie-Odile Boulnois about this passage.

[41] John 1:34. [42] Luke 1:76–77. [43] Luke 1:32.

[44] Cyril's method of argument here is the same as before. The content of John's proclamation was Christ, yet he is said to be a "prophet of the Most High." Taking the latter to be an objective genitive implies that Christ is "the Most High."

[45] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς.

[46] Gk.: ὁ μὲν τῆς οἰκονομίας τρόπος ἐν ἰδίοις ἔσται λόγοις. Literally, "the mode of the economy will be in its own words/principles."

[47] Heb 13:8. On the immutability of the divine Word, see also *c. Iul.* 8.39, where Cyril quotes Plotinus in support of this claim.

10.6 Furthermore, I think it is incumbent upon me to convict Julian of fighting in an impious manner against John's statements too. For it is simply not true that, as he claims, John observed people "*revering*" "*the tombs*" of the saints (I mean those "*of Paul and Peter*"),[48] and thus was led to say that Jesus Christ is God. For it would be implausible to suppose that this is the reason why he was inexorably provoked to ascribe divinity to [Christ], when in fact it was the Holy Spirit that was prompting him. For Christ at one point said to the holy mystagogues, "It is not you who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father who is speaking in you."[49] Nor was he the first who said Jesus was God. Rather, those who wrote before [686] him – I mean Luke, Matthew, and indeed also Mark – were naming him "Lord" and "God," everywhere assigning the supreme glory to him. Furthermore, because Julian apparently puts lying on equal footing with the most excellent acts of virtue, he maintains that the divine evangelist said, "And the Word became flesh," though without also saying "*how*" this happened – being somehow "*ashamed*" I suppose – "*and he nowhere*," claims Julian, "*calls him either 'Jesus' or 'Christ' in the section where he calls him 'God the Word.'*"[50]

Yet is it not rather the case that [John's] discourse on these topics is exceedingly subtle and very nuanced, with its edge honed to razor-sharp truth?[51] For to prevent someone from surmising that the incarnate[52] Word came into being at the time of his birth in the flesh or to prevent someone from saying that God has only just appeared recently, he had to explain in detail at the outset that "he existed in the beginning," being God the Word, and that, since he was coeternal with the Father, he was "with God" (for he is one[53] with his begetter thanks to a natural identity, although he exists and is understood to be in his own *hypostasis*), and that "all things came to be through him."[54] For this reason, after masterfully stating all this in his preface, he lowered his discourse for the task of [687] narrating the mystery of the economy with the flesh.[55] For he said "the

[48] See *c. Gal.* fr. 79.12–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1.21–22). While Cyril summarizes the criticism of John as one who "observed" (or "watched the spectacle," τεθεαμένος) of the cult of Peter and Paul, Julian had only claimed that John had "sensed" that a crowd of people were being led astray and "heard" that the tombs of Peter and Paul were being revered.

[49] Matt 10:20. [50] See *c. Gal.* fr. 79.15–17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1.24–27).

[51] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένος εἰς ἀλήθειαν. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.

[52] Gk.: τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα λόγον, literally, "the enhumanized Word." [53] Cf. John 10:30.

[54] Cf. John 1:1–3.

[55] Gk.: τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας … τὸ μυστήριον. Cf. Cyril, *Jo.* 1:11 (1.130.14–17 Pusey), where Cyril similarly says the evangelist "gradually descends" from a discussion of "pure theology" to "an explanation of the economy with the flesh."

Word became flesh"[56] (that is, human), though not by undergoing an alteration into what he was not, since the divine is free from change and its stability in this state is not something it receives externally, but is rather rooted essentially in its nature. And [John] has confirmed that, having taken his all-hallowed flesh from the holy virgin, he came forth as a man and remained what he was. For he says, "And he dwelt among us."[57] This would not imply that via alteration or change he was converted into the nature of the flesh, but rather that he dwelt, or came to be, in his own body as though it were a holy temple.

10.7 But that man who understands none of these passages brings an all too hasty condemnation of the inspired writer and, in addition to this, says [John the evangelist] has made his discourse about the only-begotten because he placed his trust in the words of John [the Baptist] without subjecting them to examination, and yet he still did not name him "Christ" or "Jesus." But it is possible to see from the sacred scriptures themselves that he is now pointlessly blathering and hasn't put any
[688] thought whatsoever into the accusation he is making. For [John the evangelist] accepts as true the statements made by the holy Baptist about Christ, the Savior of us all. Yet after saying "The Word became flesh," then and only then at that critical moment does he name him "Christ" and "Jesus" and say that he possesses divine dignities, even though he had come to be like us for the purpose of the economy.[58]

Consequently, he himself has also written as follows: "Now when he was <in> Jerusalem during the Feast of Passover, many people believed in his name because they saw the signs he was performing for the sick. But Jesus himself did not entrust himself to them because he knew all people."[59] And again, "Therefore when it was evening on that day, the first day of the week, and the doors where his disciples had gathered were locked out of fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood among them and said to them, 'Peace be with you.'"[60] And at one point he said the Lord himself also spoke to God the Father in heaven: "And this is eternal life: that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you sent."[61] So one can learn through his own words that [John the evangelist] has retained divinely appropriate descriptions also for the one who has come to be like us.[62] For he names him "life" and "light" in many
[689] places, and indeed also says he does the same acts as the Father with the

[56] John 1:14. [57] John 1:14. [58] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς. [59] John 2:23–24. [60] John 20:19.
[61] John 17:3.
[62] That is, the evangelist does not merely ascribe divine attributes to the Word in the prologue (as Cyril takes Julian to claim), but in other places also describes the enfleshed one, named "Jesus" and "Christ," in divinely befitting terms, as seen in the passages cited in this paragraph.

same majesty and is quite appropriately crowned with the incomparable superiority over all things.

10.8 Now that man who loves faultfinding and runs through every bad idea, who is forever on the hunt attempting to find something that might allow him (so he thinks) to ruin Christianity,[63] also proceeds down another path, as it were, and says,

Julian

Nevertheless, I am not disputing that John says this about Jesus Christ. Yet some of the impious think it best to hold that Jesus Christ is one person while the Word proclaimed by John is someone else.[64] *That, however, is not the case. For the one who he says is God the Word is the same one he says was acknowledged by John the Baptist as being Jesus Christ. Observe, then, how discreetly, quietly, and surreptitiously he inserts into the drama an impious finishing touch, and how he is such a huckster and scoundrel that he backtracks from his earlier statement and adds, "No one has ever seen God. The only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he has explained him."*[65] *Is, then, this only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father also God the Word who became flesh? And if he is, which is my view, then you, too, no doubt have in fact seen God. For "he dwelt" among you and you have seen "his glory."*[66] *Why, then, do you also say that "no one has ever seen" God? For you yourselves have seen, if not God the Father, at least God the Word. But if the only-begotten Son is someone other than God the Word, as I have heard from some of your sect,*[67] *then it appears that not even John had yet dared this.*[68] [690]

[63] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

[64] With this sentence, Julian signals his awareness of the debates over the deity of the Son of God that were carried on throughout the fourth century (the so-called "Arian controversy"), including during his own reign as emperor. By "some of the impious" he is referring to one of the parties to this debate who distinguished between Jesus Christ and the Word proclaimed by the Johannine prologue. It is difficult to determine which specific group Julian has in mind with this allusive remark. See Boulnois 2020c, 209–12, who surveys the evidence for the two main options that have been proposed: the "Arians," as well as Marcellus of Ancyra and his follower Photinus (the latter mentioned by name in *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 8.15–16]). Whomever he is referring to, the position Julian himself here takes (i.e., identifying the Word with Jesus Christ) is the one that was held by Athanasius and his allies who advocated for the Council of Nicaea as the standard of orthodoxy, as Cyril himself acknowledges in the first sentence of *c. Iul.* 10.9.

[65] John 1:18. [66] Cf. John 1:14.

[67] The word for "sect" is αἵρεσις, which Christians also used to refer to doctrinally deviant groups (i.e., "heresy"). Given that Julian is here discussing Christological debate among competing Christian groups, one might think he is using Christians' own language of "heresy." But earlier in *Against the Galileans* he himself refers to Christianity as the "sect of the Galileans" (τῆς Γαλιλαίων … αἱρέσεως; *c. Gal.* fr. 3.5 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.9.6]), so he probably is not intending to denote one of the various positions in the Christological debate as a "heresy" but is instead referring to Christianity in general as a deviant breakaway movement. The term was also used to refer to Christianity as a sect within Judaism in Acts 24:5; 24:14; 28:22, which could lie behind Julian's use of the term.

[68] *c. Gal.* fr. 80 Mas.; Wright 1923, 412–15.

Cyril

10.9 So then, someone could perhaps suppose that Julian, with a mind apt for learning, agrees with orthodox considerations and so identifies the incarnate Word of God with Jesus Christ. However, from the words I have cited one can see that his present undertaking is once more a
[691] cunning ploy. For he thought he could demonstrate that the most excellent evangelist was marching out against his own words and making battle against what he himself had said. But "a treacherous man will not catch his prey," as it has been written.[69] For [John] said, and this very sensibly, that "No one has ever seen God,"[70] since everyone would agree that the divine cannot be seen, but with the eyes of our mind we have seen the Son who is resplendent with the glory of God the Father and radiates the beauty of his begetter.

And this has been shown through the very things that have been accomplished; for he is indeed the "imprint" and "radiance of his glory,"[71] and it is not with respect to bearing *our* image that he resembles him (for, as I said, the divine is incorporeal, formless, without quantity or size, and quite simply beyond mind and speech); rather, this description holds true insofar as he is understood as God, being everything the Father is with the sole exception of being a father. For instance, when one of the holy apostles at one point said, "Lord, show us the Father and it will be
[692] enough for us," he answered with the words, "Have I been with you for such a long time, Philip, and you still do not know me? The one who has seen me has seen the Father."[72] Yet wouldn't one, I think, quite rightly conclude that, if indeed his aim was to say that his begetter resembles the form of his body,[73] why did he instead say, "If I am not doing my Father's works, do not believe me; but if I am doing them, even if you do not believe me, believe my works"?[74] For those beings that possess an invariably identical activity would of course also have the exact same definition[75] of their nature.

10.10 Therefore, Your Excellency, I would say we will not find the divine evangelist opposing his own words even if he says, "no one has ever seen God." Nor is it the case that, if we have indeed seen Jesus in the sense explained above, this would make the shield-bearer of the truth a liar; rather, the matter is true in both respects: the Son is invisible with

[69] Prov 12:27. [70] John 1:18. [71] Cf. Heb 1:3. [72] John 14:8–9.
[73] Although the GCS editors have suggested that there is a lacuna in Cyril's sentence, we understand it to be a case of anacolouthon, which we have attempted to capture in our translation.
[74] John 10:37–38. [75] Gk.: λόγος.

respect to the nature of his divinity, and yet is visible in a divinely appropriate glory, even when he had become human. For it was at that time that we saw both him and "his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father full of grace and truth."[76] [693]

In any case, the divine David also loudly shouted the mystery of the incarnation in advance with the words, "God, our God, will come in visible manner, and he will not pass by in silence."[77] And indeed the prophet Isaiah as well, almost as if stretching out his hand, points to his enfleshment and says, "Behold our God, behold the Lord comes with strength and his arm with authority."[78] Likewise, I would bring into the discussion the blessed Baruch as well who agrees with Isaiah's words. For he himself at one point also said, "This is our God; no other will be reckoned along with him. He procured every path of knowledge and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel, his beloved. And after these things he appeared on earth and lived together with humans."[79] Therefore, we have in fact seen the Son as a human on earth going through life together with humans, being invisible with the Father in terms of the nature of his divinity but visible in an intelligible sense, also with the Father, by the preeminence of his divinity and mighty works. For he used to perform divine signs with a mere nod.

10.11 Next that accuser of everything holy, who runs willy-nilly after every single one of his concoctions, indicts us for being overly attached to reverence for the holy martyrs and says, [694]

Julian

> *Nevertheless, this evil idea did take its origin from John.*[80] *And who could feel a sufficient amount of disgust at everything you subsequently invented, piling so many recent corpses upon that corpse from long ago? You have filled the world with sepulchers and tombs, even though nowhere in your scripture does it say that you ought to haunt sepulchers*[81] *and treat them with honor.*[82] *And*

[76] John 1:14. [77] Ps 49(50):2–3. [78] Isa 40:9–10. [79] Bar 3:36–38.

[80] "This evil idea" (τοῦτο … τὸ κακόν) refers to the divinization of the man Jesus, the topic Julian introduced in *c. Gal.* fr. 79 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.1).

[81] Gk.: τοῖς τάφοις προσκαλινδεῖσθαι, an allusion to Plato, *Phd.* 81d1 (περὶ τὰ μνήματά τε καὶ τοὺς τάφους κυλινδουμένη). Eunapius makes the same allusion, also with reference to Christian devotion to the dead, at *VS* 6.11.8. See also Julian, *Mis.* 10.344a.

[82] Julian's criticism here of the Christian cult of the martyrs aligns with other events that occurred while he was residing in Antioch in 362–63. In an attempt to revive the famous oracle of Apollo in the suburb of Daphne, he ordered the removal of corpses that had been buried in the vicinity, including most prominently the relics of the martyr Babylas, whose remains had been transferred

you have proceeded to such a degree of depravity that you don't even think it necessary to listen to the words of Jesus of Nazareth on this topic. Hear, then, what he says about the tombs: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for you are like white-washed sepulchers. The outside of the sepulcher appears beautiful but inside it is filled with the bones of the dead and with every kind of pollution."[83] *If, then, Jesus said sepulchers are full of pollution, how can you invoke God at them?*

Moreover, [Julian] adds to this that when one of the disciples said, *"Lord, permit me first to go and bury my father," [Jesus] said, "Follow me and let the dead bury their own dead."*[84]

[695]

Cyril

10.12 Now we have already said much in dispute with Julian about these topics and have expended many words in the preceding sections,[85] but I think I must say a few things to him now as well. Indeed, we admit that graves containing bodies are not free from pollution, although this is not a sufficient reason to forget the virtue of the dead. Rather, the fact that those who practiced to perfection the admirable life had a body "from the earth" that has been dissolved by the law of nature "into earth"[86] does not imply that we take lightly our duty of honoring them, since one would in some way praise those who chose to live in an excellent and most renowned manner and in many cases disregarded even death itself, so that some noteworthy aspect of their story might be

to the location during the reign of Julian's half-brother Gallus in order to silence the oracle (Ammianus 22.12.8). The temple, including its famous statue of the god, subsequently caught fire in October 362 in mysterious circumstances, leading Julian to suspect that the fire had been set by Christians in retaliation for the transfer of the martyr's relics (Julian, *Mis.* 33.361bc; Ammianus 22.13.2). On these events, see Elm 2012, 275–81. Julian's concern over the pollution from dead bodies is also apparent in a famous edict he issued in February 363 banning daytime funerals, since they interfered with the business of daily life and defiled the worship of the Olympian gods. The edict can be found in *CTh.* 9.17.5. See also Julian's elaboration of the rationale for the edict in *Ep.* 136b (p.199.20 Bidez) (= *Ep.* 56 [pp.194–95 Wright]) where he uses the strongly evocative language of "disgust" (ἀηδία) as he does here (βδελύξηται). On these two texts, cf. Schmidt-Hofner 2020, 161–62. It is possible, as argued by Torres 2009, that Julian's funeral edict was specifically directed against the Christian cult of the martyrs. Julian's assumption that dead bodies bring pollution and interfere with worship of the gods was a view widely held in antiquity. See, e.g., Eunapius, *VS* 5.1.12–15, which reports that Iamblichus once avoided walking down a certain road because he perceived that a corpse had recently passed by. For other references in Julian's corpus to the martyrs, see *c. Her.* 22.228c; *Mis.* 10.344a; 28.357c; 33.361a, along with the discussion at Nesselrath 2020b, 6–9.

[83] Matt 23:27. [84] *c. Gal.* fr. 81 Mas.; Wright 1923, 414–17. The last line quotes Matt 8:21–22.
[85] See *c. Iul.* 6.28–30 with note; and frs. 64a and 64b. [86] Gen 3:19; Sir 41:10.

inscribed in the memories of people to come. For I've heard of someone in Homer's poems who says,

> Let me not perish without struggle and without glory,
> But by doing something great for later generations also to hear about.[87]

So then, when it comes to someone who has departed from the human realm "not without struggle and without glory" and has accomplished "something great" that one might rightly be proud of, is it right to abandon such a person to silence and forgetfulness or to crown them with the best kind of admiration of all – to gladden them with a lasting and undying honor, and thereby practically join in their exploits and share in their courage? For don't those who are determined to praise the martyrs' complete disregard for suffering as they traveled down the exceptional path in life deserve to become partners in their brave deeds? [696]

10.13 And what I already said above I will now say once more.[88] They say that, for those furnished with an especially sophisticated tongue and given to delivering eulogies, annual competitions were held at Athens dedicated to the people who bore the brunt of warfare for the sake of Greece and who rose up against the pretension of the barbarians despite being few in number. Although there were fewer of them than their enemies' innumerable column, nevertheless, since victory was impossible, they seized a courageous death as a substitute for victory and made themselves worthy of remembrance and eulogies among the Athenians, with the result that this fact even came to function for some as an oath. For they used to say: "no, by our forefathers who bore the brunt of warfare at Marathon"; "no, by those who fought in the navy at Salamis"; "no, by those [who fought in the navy] at Artemisium"; "no, by those who stood ready for battle at Plataea"; and "no, by the many others who repose in our public tombs."[89]

Hence, given that the most eloquent elite ranks at Athens, despite being idolaters, thought it a good idea to fulfill their duty of granting honor and rewards to those who did not flee from a glorious death and indeed even to visit the very graves where their bodies lay – for they used to give their speeches at the very place where those who carried out the courageous deeds were laid to rest – was not His Excellency Julian then incorrect to cry out against the Christians' sense of what is virtuous, on grounds that they attach great value to revering and honoring the holy

[87] Homer, *Il.* 22.304–05. [88] Cf. *c. Iul.* 6.28.10–16; fr. 64b.
[89] Cyril's list of examples is drawn, mostly verbatim, from Demosthenes, *De cor.* 208. Clement of Alexandria quoted a portion of this speech at *Str.* 6.2.20.2.

martyrs, all of whom achieved <self-mastery> and by their blood exchanged this temporary life for that which is secure in faith and for the
[697] glorious achievements of their devotion to Christ? Or maybe the reason he has become so incredibly angry and thinks he must mock them is that they themselves did not become cowardly apostates throwing down their shields, they were not careless, they did not retreat, and they did not disparage devotion to God – the exact thing, of course, which that man himself did who is denouncing the fortitude inherent in them.[90]

10.14 "That's all very well," Julian says, "but one must avoid those sepulchers that even Christ himself said were full of pollution,[91] and Christ knew the dead were so disgusting that he did not permit his disciple to bury his father."[92] Now, first of all, we will easily see that he is utterly ignorant of the import of the Savior's words. For he did not command them to keep away from sepulchers, even though he knew they were filled with "the bones of the dead and every kind of pollution"; rather, it seemed to him a good idea to liken to whitewashed sepulchers the dissembling and hypocritical band of the Pharisees who stole the outward appearance of virtue yet had hearts full of every kind of vice and pollution, in an intelligible sense that is. Furthermore, by telling his disciple that he must instead follow him and leave the burial of the dead to others, he taught that it would be appropriate and reasonable for our concern about our own affairs to take a back seat to our love of God, since divine matters are more important even than reverence for one's parents, since he is the generator and maker of the universe.[93]

And by deigning to visit the dead and even their very tombs, [Christ] clearly shows that he realized neither sepulchers nor corpses are able to
[698] produce any defilement in the souls of humans. So it was that he commanded that Lazarus, who was even at the point of stinking, should come back to life.[94] So it was that the synagogue ruler's little girl miraculously came back to life; for it says that he touched her hand and said, "Child, arise."[95] And indeed also at Nain (this is one of the cities in Judea) he raised the widow's son by "touching his coffin" and calling out, "Young man, I say to you, rise."[96]

For, what defilement could the remains of a dead man produce in our minds? Could that which fills our sense of smell with stench pollute the

[90] On Julian's apostasy, cf. *c. Iul.* Dedic.4 with note. [91] Cf. Matt 23:27. [92] Cf. Matt 8:21–22.
[93] The final two sentences of this paragraph also appear verbatim in the catena tradition on the Gospel of Luke: Cyril, *Hom. Lc.* 9:59 (97.21–26 Sickenberger). Cyril also discusses honoring God above one's parents at *c. Iul.* frs. 40a and 40b.
[94] John 11:38–44. [95] Luke 8:54. [96] Luke 7:14.

mind that is in us or could it even divert us towards what is not right? Wouldn't this be a completely naïve thing to say? Besides, one can observe that the remains of the departed are not carelessly cast into the ground naked but are well-clothed, since they are concealed in holes in the ground, as if hidden in the bosom of a mother.

10.15 And if someone wanted to speak on behalf of the dead, he might say, "Why do you[97] regard sepulchers and corpses as disgusting? What harm could, say, a body or a sepulcher impart to those who draw near to them? Can it render the lover of justice unjust? Can it make the virtuous and self-controlled person licentious and undisciplined? Can it make [699] someone who is superior to greed succumb to wealth? Can it make the affable and gentle person cruel and savage, the person who loves God to be impious?" Obviously not! For the remains of the departed, I think, can hardly corrupt the goods of the soul; instead, it is the inclination of the will towards what is utterly shameful that does so. Do you see these laws here which guide human affairs towards well-being? They are the ones that punish adulterers, the unjust, rapists, and those caught in still other crimes. Obviously, however, there are no laws stating that someone who goes off to sepulchers or visits corpses deserves punishment.

"Nevertheless," [they claim], "sepulchers render certain people defiled and suffice to lead them astray and are full of a pollution that touches the soul through the foul smell they contain." If so, then perfume shops and loitering in them ought to prove beneficial for the wicked and set them free from their wicked behavior, and someone caught in an indictment for adultery should just crown himself with roses, anoint his body with perfume, and so be free of every charge. For if the pollution of sepulchers renders people bad, then the places that smell most pleasant, and indeed the most fragrant of flowers too, should cleanse them from their badness!

Nevertheless, they will probably think to themselves that they have grasped and are stating something essential in fabricating the following objection: "Indeed every corpse and even death itself are among those things most abhorred by the gods. So we share the gods' viewpoint on this matter and are depending upon the same norms as them." Well, the first thing that must be said is that the God-breathed scripture has declared to us that there is one true God by nature, and our custom is to worship no one else at all besides him. However, if, as you would have it, there exist gods, and if, as you say, they too regard death with hatred,

[97] The verb form here is plural (ἡγεῖσθε) so presumably Cyril has in mind Julian along with his imagined partisans.

then presumably they are struggling and suffering alongside the inhabit-
[700] ants of the earth who have fallen under the sway of corruption and death. If, nonetheless, there are gods and if they have truly shared in the suffering of those under the sway of corruption, why do they not instead remove from its influence those who are caught in its clutches and are living miserable lives – even if perhaps not everyone, why don't they at least show compassion towards their own worshippers? But the one who holds the first place among the poets[98] knew that they were terrified of Hades and consequently he even regarded it as a place to be used in oaths of abjuration; for he introduced one of the gods as swearing and saying,

> Now let Earth and broad Heaven above be my witness
> And the downward flowing water of the Styx, which is
> The greatest and most terrible oath for the blessed gods.[99]

And at one point he has Hera say to Zeus, her brother and husband,

> Most dreadful son of Cronus, what's this plan you have uttered!
> A man that is mortal, doomed long ago by fate,
> How could you intend to deliver him from ill-sounding death?
> Do what you will, but all the rest of us gods do not approve.[100]

For why, she is saying, do you not realize that your attempt is futile and you are seeking something out of reach? If so, do you then really think you are invariably staying completely within the bounds of sound reasoning and indeed do you not realize you have lost your claim to any
[701] praise?

10.16 Hence, when those among the Greeks inspired by the Muses, who have won a reputation for speaking the words of God and who are well acquainted with divine matters, say that the gods are inferior to death and the fates, why does Julian call Christ a "*corpse*" when in fact he was superior to death and the destroyer of corruption? For by his ineffable and divinely fitting mandate and by his life-giving power he has driven death away from others while also willingly permitting his own flesh to encounter death, not to ratify our existence as corpses but instead to loosen the bonds of corruption and destroy death. For since the body of the very Son who "gives life to all things"[101] is itself a body of life, for

[98] For a similar appeal to Homer to critique the Greek gods' relationship to death, cf. *c. Iul.* 2.4.1–18; 6.13.17–23.

[99] Homer, *Il.* 15.36–38. [100] Homer, *Il.* 16.440–43. [101] 1 Tim 6:13.

this very reason it could not countenance the bonds of death, and quite reasonably so. Indeed, how could the living and life-giving one, who has rendered the power of death impotent, be a corpse?[102]

Furthermore, Julian commits no less of an offense when he names as "*corpses*" those who, hoping in life, endured the temporary death of the flesh, I mean the holy martyrs about whom it has been written with exceptional clarity, "In the eyes of humans they seem to have died, and [702] their departure was considered to be a suffering and their going from us to be an affliction, but they are at peace and their hope is full of immortality";[103] for, as the Savior himself says at one point, "they are alive with respect to God"[104] and are destined to live in the future. For they exhibited such brilliant fortitude for the sake of the one who is not "the God of corpses but the God of the living."[105] I think, then, that we have given a very sensible response to him on this point.

10.17 Nevertheless, that man, who either does not understand or does not think it right to admire such extraordinary deeds, once more lies and says,

Julian

> *Therefore, in light of this why do you haunt the tombs? Do you want to hear the reason? I am not the one who will tell you, but the prophet Isaiah will: "They sleep among the tombs and among the caves for the sake of dreams."*[106] *You see, therefore, how ancient this practice of magical trickery was among the Jews, to sleep among the tombs for the sake of dreams. It is likely that your apostles, after their teacher's death, also practiced this and handed it down to you who at the outset first believed, and that they performed for you magic tricks with greater skill and displayed openly to those who came after them the workshops of this magical trickery and loathsome behavior.*[107] [703]

Cyril

10.18 So then, it is true that Christ came to life again for the purpose of the economy,[108] having, as I said, permitted his own body to taste death, since death was rendered impotent through this act. Julian, however, ought to come forward and prove where the divine disciples

[102] This paragraph (*c. Iul.* 10.16.3–12) was cited by Severus of Antioch in his *Philalethes* (176 Hespel), and as a result it survives in Syriac translation, on which see Kaufhold, GCS 21, 874–77.
[103] Wis 3:2–4. [104] Cf. Luke 20:38b. [105] Cf. Luke 20:38a. [106] Isa 65:4.
[107] *c. Gal.* fr. 82 Mas.; Wright 1923, 416–17. [108] Gk.: οἰκονομικῶς.

"*handed down*" to us that we must both "*haunt tombs*" and seek visions or "*dreams*" from the dead. He will not be able to do so – how could he?! Here again he is being deceptive. Yet this good fellow does not realize that on this very point he is pouring forth accusations, not against us, but rather against the superstition of the Greeks, and that he is attempting to mock what he himself in fact welcomes as a serious pursuit. For both the Jews and we who came after them follow the holy and divine laws and thus do not have a custom of seeking visions in dreams, nor for that matter of delighting in pointless products of the imagination like a child; rather, our custom is to regard the interpreters of such things as detestable. So says the law about them in *Deuteronomy*: "If a prophet or a dreamer should arise among you and give you a sign or portent, and the sign or the portent that they say to you comes to pass, [704] saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods whom you do not know,' you shall not listen to the words of that prophet nor the person with that dream."[109] While we have therefore been commanded to turn away from "shadowy dreams,"[110] these things are nevertheless regarded by the servants of daemons as cherished and serious pursuits of the utmost importance.

10.19 Porphyry, for example, in giving a clear account of Pythagoras's life, at one point says the following:

> And Antiphon, in his book *On the Life of those Foremost in Virtue*, also relates his perseverance while in Egypt and says that, when he was following the way of life of the Egyptian priests and was eager to participate in it, Pythagoras requested that the tyrant Polycrates write to Amasis, king of Egypt who was his friend and host, so that he might be admitted into the education of the aforementioned people.[111]

And he explains what kind of instruction this was when he adds,

> And Pythagoras, he says, also visited the Egyptians, the Arabs, and the Chaldeans from whom he both attained a precise knowledge about dreams and became the first to practice divination by incense. And in Egypt he lived together with the priests and became well acquainted with their wisdom and the Egyptian language.[112]

Hence, practicing magical trickery was not a secondary concern for Julian's forebears but was instead viewed as a serious matter, one reckoned

[109] Deut 13:1(2)–3(4).
[110] The phrase "shadowy dreams" (ἀμενηνῶν ὀνείρων) comes from Homer, *Od.* 19.562.
[111] Porphyry, *VP* 39.4–11. Antiphon's work is also mentioned in Diogenes Laertius 8.3.
[112] Porphyry, *VP* 41.6–11.

to be among those pursuits worthy of the highest admiration, so much so that many people made journeys to foreign lands for the sake of this sorcery. [705]

But since he puts forward the words of Isaiah as a confirmation of his lies, thinking that by them he could convict those who have been instructed in the divine law on grounds that haunting tombs and longing for dreams was something dear to them, he will hear this response from us: during those times when they yielded their neck to the sacred laws with the intent of serving the one true God by nature, who is the generator and Lord of the universe, you will discover that they are entirely exempt from an indictment on the grounds you propose. Yet during the period when they served other falsely named gods, at that time, at that time indeed, one can observe them both dwelling amidst the unclean tombs and becoming lovers of dream-divination. And as proof of what I'm saying I will use the prophet's words, since he spoke the following as though from the mouth of God: "These are the people who provoke me to my face continually, they burn incense in gardens and offer incense on bricks to the daemons that do not exist, and they sleep among the tombs and among the caves for the sake of dreams."[113] Hence, when they neglected their duty to affix themselves to the one who is God by nature and offered sacrifices and service to Julian's gods (that is, the unclean daemons), then it was that they even slept in tombs and regarded the apparitions of dreams as a kind of divination and sorcery. [706]

10.20 Moreover, I am amazed that, although the history of the Greeks is available for everyone to read and it is also possible for anyone who wishes to do so to see without difficulty what is written in it about Julian's gods, this man reproaches us about corpses and sepulchers when he too has corpses as objects of worship and tombs as temples (for they are piled up in their temples).[114]

And though mere empirical observation would suffice as a proof of this point, it can also be easily shown through both ancient documents and histories. For in fact Dinarchus, being no insignificant poet, in relating the deeds of Dionysus and all his labors in the land of the Indians and indeed also how he had murdered Actaeon and Lycurgus, gives a very

[113] Isa 65:3–4. Note that Cyril quotes more of this passage than Julian had, including the mention of "daemons that do not exist," in order to undermine Julian's interpretation of it.

[114] George, a previous bishop of Alexandria, was, according to Ammianus, killed "by the whole populace" because he called a pagan temple a tomb (22.11.7–8).

clear account and contends that he was also killed by Perseus, yet was buried at Delphi in the presence of the so-called golden Apollo.[115]

Furthermore, Porphyry once again says the following about Pythagoras:

> And after these things, when the tyranny of Polycrates had seized the Samians, [Pythagoras] considered it inappropriate for a man of philosophy to live under such a government and decided to leave for Italy. And when in the course of his voyage he landed at Delphi, he inscribed an elegy on the tomb of Apollo in which he explained that Apollo was the son of Silenus but was killed by Pytho and was buried[116] in the so-called Tripod which had obtained this name on account of the fact that it was there that
> [707] the three young daughters of Triopas mourned for Apollo.[117]

The renowned Tripod, which gave oracles for the cities and regions of the Greeks and was admired by them, was the tomb of the one said to have proclaimed the oracles, whom the three daughters of Triopas had pitifully lamented when they saw him destroyed and over whose prostrate corpse they wailed mournfully, as I said. And the deeds of Pythagoras do not end here, for Porphyry again wrote about him,

> And descending into a cave called Idaeus, carrying black sacrifices,[118] he stayed there for the customary three and nine days and made offerings to Zeus and saw the throne that is annually furnished with cushions for him and he carved an epigram upon the tomb, inscribing "Pythagoras to Zeus" which begins with "Here lies the great Zan whom they call by the name Zeus."[119]

[115] All of the information related here (Dionysus' deeds in India, his killing of Actaeon and Lycurgus, death at the hands of Perseus, and burial at Delphi beside the golden Apollo) are also found in Eusebius' *Chronicon*, so the report is probably entirely based upon that source. Cyril also mentioned in passing Perseus' killing of Dionysus and the latter's burial at Delphi at *c. Iul.* 1.12.17–19 (for Dionysus' burial, cf. *c. Iul.* frs. 42; 64b). Though in that earlier passage he made no mention of Dinarchus (an otherwise rather obscure poet, in spite of Cyril's note to the contrary here, unless he is to be identified with the Attic orator of that name), Eusebius' *Chronicon* had done so (Eusebius, *Chron*. II, p.54b.15–26 Helm; p.168 Karst).

[116] We owe to Cyril the words "by Pytho and was buried," which are lacking in all mss of Porphyry's *VP.*

[117] Porphyry, *VP* 43.3–12. Apollo's burial in the Tripod and the story of how it derived its name is also given at *c. Iul.* fr. 64b. For the possible historical connections of this account, see Elderkin 1941.

[118] The manuscripts of *c. Iul.* have ἱερεῖα ἔχων μέλανα ("having black sacrifices") while the manuscript tradition of Porphyry's work reads ἔρια ἔχων μέλανα ("having black wool"). Earlier editions of *c. Iul.* emended the text to follow the reading in Porphyry's treatise, presumably on the assumption that ἱερεῖα arose via scribal corruption of ἔρια. We follow the GCS text, which prints ἱερεῖα, though the editors note that the emendation may be correct; Porphyry could, after all, specify certain sacrificial victims as black in color (ἱερεῖα τετράποδα μέλανα; *Phil. Orac.* fr. 315.8 Smith [= Eusebius *P.e.* 4.9.3]).

[119] Porphyry, *VP* 43.16–22. Cyril mentions the same information about Pythagoras in *c. Iul.* fr. 42, but does not name Porphyry as his source. The epigram is mentioned in John Chrysostom, *Hom.*

Therefore, if they think Pythagoras spoke nonsense when he engraved "Here lies Zan" upon Zeus's tomb, why do they regard him with such admiration? But if in fact they do say he is worthy of all admiration, then one can no longer suppose or claim he made an erroneous statement, since what he has written is true. Thus, the highest of their gods has died, and the Cretans have even built his tomb.[120] [708]

10.21 In addition, Clement, an eloquent and indeed also very learned man, said the following about the gods and temples:

> For we shall by no means keep silent about this. But when it comes to them as well, we shall disclose that though they are euphemistically named "temples," they are in fact tombs, that is, the tombs have come to be called "temples." And I call upon you, even now, to utterly forget superstition out of shame at honoring the tombs. In the temple of Athena in the acropolis in Larissa there is the tomb of Acrisius, and in the acropolis at Athens there is the tomb of Cecrops, as Antiochus says in his ninth book of *Histories*. And what of Erichthonius? Is he not buried in the temple of Athena Polias? And is not Immaradus, the son of Eumolpus and Daeira, [709] in the enclosure of the Eleusinium that is beneath the acropolis, and are not the daughters of Celeus buried in Eleusis? Why should I recount for you the Hyperborean women? They are called Hyperoche and Laodice, and they are buried in the Artemisium at Delos; it is in the temple of the Delian Apollo. And Leandrius says that in the Didymaeum at Miletus there is buried Chleochus. Here, following Zeno of Myndus, it would not be right for us to pass over the sepulchre of Leucophryne (she is buried in the temple of Artemis in Magnesia), nor indeed the altar of Apollo in Telmessus (they record that it is the tomb of Telmessus the soothsayer). And Ptolemy, the son of Agesarchus, in the first book of his work *About Philopator* says that both Cinyras and Cinyras' descendants are buried in the temple of Aphrodite at Paphos.[121]

Will you then still dare to reproach us about tombs and corpses? Or will you subdue your laughter out of sullen-faced pity for your own dead gods in the realization that those places you suppose are sacred are in fact graves for their corpses? [710]

in Tit. 3 (PG 62.676d), though without the attribution to Pythagoras. During Julian's reign as emperor a certain Plutarch offered a sacrifice to Zeus in the cave in question on Mount Ida, recording the deed in an inscription. See Wiemer 2020, 218.

[120] Zeus's tomb in Crete was previously a topic of debate in Origen, *Cels.* 3.43. For a (legendary) report of Cyril debating with pagans about the death of Zeus, see the Coptic text published by Hintze and Morenz 1954.

[121] Clement, *Protr.* 3.44.4–45.4. Eusebius had cited this same passage, though at greater length, at *P.e.* 2.6.1–7. Much of the same material is repeated in Arnobius, *adv. Nat.* 6.6; Theodoret, *Affect.* 8.30.

10.22 In addition, Julian indicts us on the grounds that we pay no regard to the commands of the law and indeed he goes on to say,

Julian

But as for you, you not only pursue those things that God in the beginning said were detestable through both Moses and the prophets, but you also repudiate bringing victims to the altar and sacrificing them.[122] *"Yes," he says,*[123] *"because fire does not descend from heaven as it did in the case of Moses, consuming the sacrifice." This happened to Moses once, and again after much time had passed it happened to Elijah the Tishbite.*[124] *For I will show in a few words that Moses himself in fact thought it necessary to introduce fire from an external source, as did the patriarch Abraham even earlier than him.*

And after calling to mind the story about Isaac, Julian takes "*Abel and his contemporaries*" as a further example and indeed also says, "*When they sacrificed they too did not have fire from heaven but they used to bring fire to the altars from elsewhere themselves*." In addition to this, Julian investigates[125] the rationale in both cases (for while God praises Abel's sacrifice, he
[711] regarded Cain's as unacceptable), as well as what the following verse might be trying to indicate: "If you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, have you not sinned? Be silent!"[126] And he attempts to harmonize some such rationale with his own theories. "*For*," he says, "*rather than sacrifices of ripe fruits and produce from the earth, it is the sacrifice of animals that is altogether more pleasing to God, since he himself is a living being*."[127]

[122] Cf. Porphyry, *Chr.* 118D Becker (= fr. 79 Harnack).

[123] The subject of φησίν ("he/it says") is unspecified. Oecolampadius has *dicunt*, leading Neumann to emend the text to φασίν ("they say"). If one adopts the plural verb (as both Neumann and Wright did), then the statement can be understood as a generalized reference to what "the Galileans" say on this point, which is less awkward than the unspecified singular verb (for just such a passage, see *c. Gal.* fr. 62.11 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 8.1.25] where the mss read φασι). We, however, follow the GCS text in reading the singular verb. Given that in the next fragment Julian refers to a bishop with whom he was having a debate (*c. Gal.* fr. 84.14 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 10.26.18]), it could be that Julian mentioned one or more individuals in this section of his work with whom he had conversations or whose works he had consulted and Cyril simply did not preserve the section identifying the individual who was the subject of the above verb. Neumann similarly emended the verb φησίν with an unspecified subject to φασίν at *c. Gal.* frs. 50.7; 54.9; 64.30; 74.4; 84.12; 85.6; 86.4, 6 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 6.42.11; 7.9.15; 8.16.9; 9.32.6; 10.26.16; 10.31.7; 10.34.19, 22).

[124] Cf. Lev 9:24; 3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 18:38.

[125] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖ; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[126] Gen 4:7.

[127] *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas.; Wright 1923, 416–19. Neumann and Masaracchia take the second paragraph of this indented quotation as entirely Cyril's own phrasing of Julian's argument (and Cyril himself admits that he has offered something of a précis of Julian's critique at *c. Iul.* 10.23.1), with these two paragraphs forming *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. We have followed the GCS editors in italicizing those segments that seem to reflect Julian's wording (partially based on resonance with the next quoted fragment, fr. 84, at *c. Iul.* 10.26.5–30), while recommending caution in placing too much confidence in the degree to which we might find Julian's precise words here.

Cyril

10.23 His entire argument is presented in my preceding summary of it. For, despite promising that he will keep his account short, he goes on pointlessly and at great length so that at every turn he might show himself to be a truth-hater. For the fact that we ourselves are in no way at all opposed to the divine decrees is something anyone can see. Rather, we yield to the words that came through Moses, fulfilling the law spiritually, and by the proclamations of the holy prophets we are steered towards the requisite knowledge of the truth and to a state of blamelessness in our knowledge of the sacred doctrines. Nevertheless, because Julian says the practice of blood sacrifices has been shunned among us and because he seemingly thinks we refrain from such service of the divine because "*fire does not descend from heaven*," we must say that he has completely missed the truth. For the reason we don't practice the sacrifice of cattle is not because God does not send down fire, but because, following the transformation of what was in types and shadows into the truth, we have been commanded to devote to the God over all a service that is spiritual and blameless. For he says, "God is Spirit and those who worship him must worship in Spirit and in truth."[128] [712]

Julian ought, however, to know that the descent of fire upon the divine altar was a prediction of the mystery in Christ: God, the best artisan of all, sent it down and gave shape to intelligible things that surpass sense perception by means of what is perceptible and visible. For it is true that God provided fire when the holy tent was erected in the wilderness by the most excellent Moses[129] and commanded that it be a perpetual and unceasing fire,[130] and, in contrast, that the introduction of "strange fire" was prohibited and punished by the divine law (for Aaron's sons perished in this manner).[131] Yet, as I said, these shadows are giving birth to the import of the mystery in Christ, since the sacred scripture always regards the divine in the form of fire. For it says that the divine appeared in this way to the sons of Israel at Mount Sinai.[132] [713]

Therefore, the fire on the altar was special and not mixed with anything else. For the one who is beyond all things, being the only God by nature, is not to be classed together with another god. For how could the sacred and divine tent have been harmed by the chance application of fire from elsewhere to the sacrifices, unless one were to consider that, if

[128] John 4:24. [129] Cf. Lev 9:24. [130] Cf. Lev 6:8–13.
[131] Cf. Lev 10:1–2, where Aaron's sons use "strange" or "foreign" fire (πῦρ ἀλλότριον).
[132] Cf. Exod 19:16–18.

"strange fire" were to be introduced, the type would harm the truth by forming it in an inappropriate manner? Assuming, that is, that there is only one who is the true God by nature and no one at all is to be classed with him, he who illuminates the truer tent, that is, the church, with an intelligible light and also accepts rational sacrifices from everyone. Therefore, we are not to conceive of any other god besides him, and we are to keep any other god away from us as "strange fire." For there is no other nature of divinity besides the one that exists.

10.24 Furthermore, the same explanation would apply also to the sacrifices that were offered at one point through Elijah. For, at that time too, the God of the universe sent down fire, while the prophet performed a type of the mystery of Christ that was appropriate to those days. Hence, it is not because "*fire does not descend*" that we "*repudiate*" the slaughter of sheep. For it is enough for us that, through the rituals performed back then, we can see with the eyes of our mind the beauty of the truth being formed as if on a canvas. Moreover, we ourselves now offer a sacrifice that is better by far than the people of old did. For now there "*descends*" from heaven, not a "*fire*" perceptible by the senses that provides an image of the ineffable nature, but instead the Holy Spirit that
[714] shines from the Father through the Son upon the church and accepts sacrifices from us too, that is, our spiritual and intelligible sacrifices.

For those descended from Israel used to offer to God cattle, sheep, turtledoves, pigeons, along with seasonal fruits, fine wheat flour soaked in oil, round cakes, and incense, but we, for our part, have put away such coarse service and have been commanded to celebrate a service that is subtle and sharpened,[133] intelligible and spiritual. For "as a pleasing aroma"[134] to God we offer every kind of virtue – faith, hope, love,[135] justice, self-control, obedience and tractability, ceaseless doxologies, and the other virtues. For this is a supremely immaterial sacrifice that is suitable for the God who is by nature simple and immaterial, and the habits of true well-being are offerings of intelligible "aroma."[136] For he himself at one point says as much: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice, and knowledge of God more than whole burnt offerings."[137] And indeed the most excel-
[715] lent Samuel also says, "Behold, is not hearing better than sacrifice and

[133] Gk.: ἀπεξεσμένην. On this metaphor, see the note at *c. Iul.* 2.12.5.
[134] Cf. Exod 29:18, 25, 41; Eph 5:2. [135] Cf. 1 Cor 13:13.
[136] The section of this paragraph beginning with "but for our part" and concluding with this sentence (= *c. Iul.* 10.24.15–23) was cited in an abbreviated form in Ps-John of Damascus, *Parall.* (PG 96.280bc).
[137] Hos 6:6. Cf. Matt 9:13; 12:7.

listening better than the fat of rams?"[138] And the divine David also sings in the psalms, "Sacrifice to God a sacrifice of praise."[139] And once more, "I went around and offered in his tent a sacrifice of shouting."[140] And Paul too commanded this, saying, "Present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God, which is your rational service."[141]

10.25 Furthermore, we can even discern from the sacred writings themselves that God did not permit the descendants of Israel to linger foolishly in the law's shadows. For although he commanded them to sacrifice a lamb as a type of Christ, he says, "Nevertheless, this is the manner in which you shall eat it: let your loins be girded, with sandals on your feet and with staffs in your hands."[142] Observe, then, how he commanded them to eat dressed like travelers, with this fact itself effectively indicating quite well that what was given in types would not stand in place for all time, but would, as it were, hasten on to the truth.[143] Therefore, since the type has flowed into the truth, we also understand the Spirit to take the place of fire perceptible to the senses and we fulfil "a service" that is spiritual and "rational."[144] For it is in this way that Christ is said to baptize us "in the Holy Spirit and in fire."[145] [716]

Moreover, if a ram was shown to Abraham, which he did in fact sacrifice in place of Isaac,[146] we maintain that it was a type of Christ who endured death in the flesh because of us and for our sake, in order to free us from death and corruption. And if, as Julian says,[147] Abraham sacrificed with "*fire from an external source,*" by applying to the sacrifices fire that certainly did not come from heaven, this is completely irrelevant to us.[148] For if it were directed against people who refuse to dedicate to God what was dictated by the law and rely on the absence of fire descending from heaven above as a pretext for "*indolence* with respect to this command,"[149] Abraham's use of "*fire from an external source*" would indeed have amounted to a compelling proof that we have disregarded the divine laws. But since we offer a service that is better than theirs, presenting spiritual sacrifices to God and being enriched with the Spirit instead of a sensible fire, he ought not accuse us by asking why we do not

[138] 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 15:22. [139] Ps 49(50):14. [140] Ps 26(27):6. [141] Rom 12:1. [142] Exod 12:11.
[143] The preceding passage also appears as a fragment in the catena tradition and was included in Pusey's edition of Cyril's *Commentary on Hebrews*, as is also the case at *c. Iul.* 3.41; 8.7; 9.17. See *Heb.* 9:10 (409.10–16 Pusey).
[144] Cf. Rom 12:1. [145] Cf. Matt 3:11 and parallels. [146] Cf. Gen 22:13.
[147] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 83.7 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22.9).
[148] Cyril (and Julian?) alludes to the fact that Abraham took fire along with him when he went to sacrifice Isaac. Cf. Gen 22:6–7.
[149] Cyril here foreshadows Julian's own language at *c. Gal.* fr. 85 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.31.30–31).

"bring victims to the altar."[150] For the divine Paul will rise up and all but cry aloud with the words, "The old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new."[151] For we have been transformed into "the newness of the life"[152] according to the gospel and we have taken our fill of perfect lessons, having given up the instruction residing in the letter of the law, since it is especially suitable for those who are still children but no longer for us who have attained "perfect manhood" and have also
[717] reached the complete "stature of the fullness of Christ."[153]

10.26 Furthermore, in addition to these things he mentions also the pair of brothers – I mean Abel and Cain who were born from Adam – and in fact he even says,

Julian

> *And this is not all, but also when the sons of Adam gave their firstfruits to God it says, "God looked upon Abel and upon his gifts, but he did not take notice of Cain and his sacrifices, and it distressed Cain greatly and his face fell. And the Lord God said to Cain, 'Why have you become so deeply distressed, and why did your face fall? If you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, have you not sinned?'"*[154] *Do you now want to hear what their offerings were? "And it came to pass after some days that Cain offered up a sacrifice to the Lord from the crops of the earth. And Abel, he too brought from the firstborn of the sheep and from their fat."*[155]
>
> *You see, he says,*[156] *[God] found fault, not with the sacrifice but with the way it was divided, saying to Cain, "If you offer correctly but do not divide correctly, have you not sinned?" This is what one of the very wise bishops said to me.*[157] *But this man first deceived himself and then others too. For when he*
> [718] *was asked in what way the division was reproachable, he did not know how to*

[150] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22.5). [151] 2 Cor 5:17. [152] Cf. Rom 6:4. [153] Cf. Eph 4:13.
[154] Gen 4:4–7. [155] Gen 4:3–4.
[156] On the unspecified subject of the verb φησίν here, see the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).
[157] Julian unfortunately does not name the bishop in question, though scholars have suspected he is referring to Aetius, a prominent leader of the Heterousian party active in the mid fourth century. See Wright 1923, 419; Malley 1978, 34 n. 126. According to Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.5.9–10, Aetius had a close relationship with Julian's half brother, Gallus, but had been sent into exile under Constantius. Upon his accession to the throne, Julian recalled Aetius and invited him to join his court (cf. Julian, *Ep.* 46 Bidez [= *Ep.* 15 Wright]). Gallus' high regard for Aetius is also noted by the Heterousian church historian Philostorgius, who additionally states that when Gallus began to suspect Julian of apostatizing from Christianity, he "repeatedly" sent the bishop to his half brother with the aim of recalling him to the faith (*H.e.* 3.27). The conversation Julian here recounts involving a bishop attempting to answer objections to Christianity put forward by Julian himself could be a description of one of these meetings with Aetius. On Aetius, see Ayres 2004, 144–49; Elm 2012, 235–45; Ritter 2020, 29–30.

give a more detailed explanation of the matter nor even how to give me an insipid answer. And when I saw him at a loss, I said, "God was right to find fault with this same thing that you have mentioned. For the two men showed the same degree of eagerness since they both thought it was necessary for them to offer gifts and sacrifices to God. Yet in terms of the way they were divided, one of them hit the mark while the other one missed it. How, or in what way did he do so? Since among those beings upon the earth, some are ensouled while others are without a soul, and since the ensouled are regarded by the living God who is the cause of life as more valuable than those without a soul, insofar as those things that are more akin to him partake of both life and soul – it was for this reason that God took delight in the one who brought the perfect sacrifice."[158]

Cyril

10.27 So then, as support for his slanderous accusation that we have shunned sacrificing in the Jewish manner Julian thought it sufficient to prove that, when Abraham sacrificed, fire did not come down from heaven and light upon the offerings, but was instead introduced from elsewhere and was of the common sort. But we have, I believe, bravely repelled his accusations and proven that, rather than knowing and stating something true, he instead lacks understanding.

However, in addition to Abraham, whom he mentioned first, he introduces "*Abel and his contemporaries*"[159] and says they too sacrificed in this manner, expecting to prove through this fact as well that Christians stand in opposition to the sacred laws. Now since he busies himself[160] with "*the sacrificial method*,"[161] and imagined he possessed some secret knowledge about it, come, yes come indeed, and let us show that in this [719] claim too he is once more – to use his own words – speaking "*insipid*"

[158] *c. Gal.* fr. 84 Mas.; Wright 1923, 418–21. Note that Porphyry, like Julian, acknowledged that creatures with souls are "more valuable" than plants but drew from this premise the opposite conclusion, that humans should not sacrifice animals (*Abst.* 2.12.4). Jean Bouffartigue has pointed out that Julian's explanation for the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice and rejection of Cain's is strikingly similar to Eusebius, *D.e.* 1.10.6–7. Eusebius offered a series of biblical examples of animal sacrifice, beginning with that of Abel, and argued that the ancients recognized that, since God was the "bestower of life and soul," no sacrifice was "more valuable" than their own souls, so they presented to God animals as "souls in place of their own souls." It is possible, as Bouffartigue proposed, that Julian is here appropriating Eusebius' argument and using it against the unnamed bishop with whom he was debating. See Bouffartigue 1992, 388.

[159] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 83.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22.13).

[160] Gk.: πολυπραγμονεῖ; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.

[161] Gk.: τῆς θυσίας τὸν τρόπον. On this phrase, see the note at *c. Iul.* 9.26.4–5.

nonsense.[162] For the God-breathed scripture said Abel offered sacrificial victims while Cain brought seasonal fruits, and that Abel's offering received the honor of God's approving glance,[163] while Cain's sacrifice was somehow slighted by God turning away from it. Then, when that holy man[164] explains that the division of the sacrifice was the cause of what happened next, Julian does not accept his explanation but arrogantly attempts on his own to state something he naïvely and uncritically assumed to be correct. For since, he says, God is life and life-giving, he delights in offerings of "*ensouled beings*" and not in those "*without a soul*" that are from the earth.[165]

Well then, the first thing to be said is that, in taking such a position, Julian himself is making war against his own instructors. For in fact Pythagoras says all over the place that sacred offerings of animals are detestable to his gods, while in contrast those consisting of crops and incense are honored and very highly regarded by them.[166] And Porphyry, for example, lectures the children of the Greeks[167] on this topic in many places and says,

> The sacrifice of animals in fact was something that came later and only very recently and originated not in gratitude as was the case with the sacrifice of crops, but instead in a context of famine or some other misfortune.[168]

Hence, he says even those gods among the Greeks take delight not in blood sacrifices since they are "very recent" and do not arise from "gratitude," but in flowers, herbs, and seasonal fruits.

[720]

10.28 So much for that man's arguments. Yet we should still subject the law that came through Moses to an investigation: so let us investigate[169] "*the sacrificial methods*"[170] in it. It commanded people who had the means of doing so to consecrate to God those of the animals that are undefiled, yet for those in more impoverished circumstances to consecrate fine wheat flour soaked in oil. "For," it says, "if his hand does not have it, his offering shall be fine wheat flour and he shall pour oil

[162] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 84.17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.21). Note that Cyril is turning back against Julian the dismissive remark he made in the above fragment about the unnamed bishop.
[163] Gk.: ἐποπτείᾳ.
[164] That is, the anonymous bishop Julian mentions in the above fragment.
[165] The section starting with this sentence and continuing through to the end of *c. Iul.* 10.30 was excerpted and included in paraphrased form in Procopius of Gaza, *Gen.* 4.2, lines 28–53 Metzler.
[166] Cf. Porphyry, *VP* 36. [167] On the metaphor of "children," see the note at *c. Iul.* 1.4.5.
[168] Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.9.1.
[169] Gk.: πολυπραγμονῶμεν; for Julian's polemical use of this term, see *c. Iul.* 2.7.5 with note.
[170] Gk.: τοὺς τῶν … θυσιῶν … τρόπους. On this phrase, see the note at *c. Iul.* 9.26.4–5.

upon it."[171] And we can also learn from Moses' laws that the ancients used to honor God, the giver of all good things to us, with crops from the earth and indeed with seasonal fruits. For it said the following: "And the Lord spoke to Moses saying, 'Speak to the sons of Israel and you shall say to them, "When you enter into the land that I am giving you and you reap its harvest, you shall also bring a sheaf as a first fruit of your harvest to the priest, and he shall offer up the sheaf before the Lord as acceptable for you."'"[172] And it says in Deuteronomy,

> And it will be, if you enter into the land the Lord your God is giving to you as an allotment and you take possession of it and dwell in it, that you shall take from the first fruit of the crops of your land that the Lord your God is giving you, and you shall put it in a basket and go to the place that the Lord your God shall choose for his name to be called upon there. And you shall go to the priest who shall be in those days and say to him, [721]
> "Today I proclaim to the Lord my God that I have entered into the land that the Lord swore to our fathers to give to us." And the priest shall take the basket from your hands and place it before the altar of the Lord your God.[173]

Hence, given that [the law] ordained the consecration of the *firstfruits* of corn and of ripe crops, how could it be the case that he rejected the sacrifice offered by Cain because it was carried out not with "*ensouled*" creatures but instead with those "*without a soul*"?[174] For it has been shown from the law – and with exceptional clarity – that God used to accept offerings without a soul together with those that have a soul. For example, since those in former times were permitted to offer up crops along with irrational animals, the divine David has the lawgiver say to those from Israel, "I will not accept calves from your house nor young goats from your flocks. For all the wild beasts of the forest are mine, herds in the mountains and cattle. I know all the birds of the sky and the beauty of a field lies with me."[175] For he calls the fruits in season "the beauty of a field."[176]

[171] Lev 2:1. Cyril's citation of this verse includes the phrase "If his hand does not have [it]" (ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἔχῃ … ἡ χείρ αὐτοῦ), in place of the following phrase in the LXX: "If a soul presents a gift, a sacrifice to the Lord" (ἐὰν δὲ ψυχὴ προσφέρῃ δῶρον θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ). The LXX verse is thus not about a special provision for those without the means to make a greater offering. The principle Cyril has in mind, is, however, present elsewhere in the Levitical code. Cf. Lev 5:7; 14:21–22.

[172] Lev 23:9–11. [173] Deut 26:1–4. [174] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 84.22–24 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.26–28).

[175] Ps 49(50):9–11.

[176] The Greek term ὡραιότης can refer to "beauty," as it is translated in the citation above, or to "the ripeness of fruits" (so LSJ, s.v. I). Cyril takes the latter sense of the word, equating it with τὰ ἐξ ὡρῶν, literally, "things from the seasons."

10.29 Moreover, one would not be mistaken, I believe, in saying that it was "*in terms of the division*"[177] of his sacrifice that Cain came to experience failure.[178] For God found fault with his sacrifice, not because he did not sacrifice lambs, but because, in setting aside the portion of his seasonal crops to offer, he was not presenting to God the exceptional part, while
[722] Abel, in contrast, was not careless but instead thoughtful when he presented his lambs as a whole burnt offering. For it says, "He brought from the firstborn and from their fat,"[179] that is, those that were better nourished than all the others, almost as if they were intoxicated with full-fat milk.[180]

Now I maintain that we must honor God by ensuring that he receives, not our substandard possessions, but the finest and most exceptional things of all. For example, at times those from Israel used to bring sacrifices but they were nothing special. God then indicted them for doing so, saying, "And you bring as offerings what was taken by violence and the lame and animals that are overworked, and you say, 'These are toilsome,' and I snorted at them, says the Lord Almighty."[181] He next integrates this with something even more burdensome to them, adding the following condemnation: "Indeed, bring them to your governor if he will take them, if he will accept your presence, says the Lord Almighty."[182] For if someone set out to honor those assigned to rule, he would surely insult them by bringing what is substandard, since things that are deformed and defective are rejected and hated by humans too. If so, then isn't it necessary to act with careful thought and bring to the Emperor and God of the universe those things in one's possession that are preeminent and specially chosen? He also, for example, made this point through one of the prophets: "Cursed is the person who has a male in his flock upon which he has placed a vow and yet sacrifices to the Lord one that is crip-
[723] pled. For I am a great king, says the Lord Almighty."[183]

10.30 Therefore, when the first humans – "*Abel and his contemporaries*"[184] – offered sacrifices, it was necessary, yes necessary indeed that they should be quite well attuned to the requisite knowledge of "*the sacrificial methods*"[185] and also of the right way to honor God, in order that those who came after them – namely us – might know the path that will lead to being renowned in these matters. And if the former people sacrificed sheep

[177] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 84.21 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.25).
[178] The reason for God's rejection of Cain's sacrifice was also considered in Augustine, *C. D.* 15.7.
[179] Gen 4:4.
[180] Cyril offers the same interpretation of this episode at *Glaph. Gen.* 1 (PG 69.36b).
[181] Mal 1:13. [182] Mal 1:8. [183] Mal 1:14. [184] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 83.10 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22.13).
[185] Gk.: τῶν θυσιῶν τοὺς τρόπους. On this phrase, see the note at *c. Iul.* 9.26.4–5.

and crops, what is there to keep us, who have received superior instruction, from now sacrificing in a manner superior to that of the ancients? But if Julian thinks one must follow the customs of the former people without deviation, come and let us imitate their actions and make sure we do not neglect anything they did. They used to tend flocks and were experts in tilling the ground and using clothing made from sheepskin. For it says, "And God made skin tunics for Adam."[186] Our life too should therefore be one of tending sheep; we ought to make tilling the ground our pursuit; and everyone should renounce fine clothing and wear sheepskin clothes instead! There was no account of medical science among them, nor of any of the other sciences, no use of letters, no experience in artisanal crafts, no cultivation of the arts; rather, the passing of time has brought these to light.

Hence, even though they missed the mark by not knowing how to sacrifice correctly and in a divinely pleasing manner (for they did not yet know "*the methods*" used in intelligible service), God nevertheless used to accept them, not by looking at the rite itself but instead by testing the motivation of the person intending to honor him.[187] And, as time moved on, it made us experts in the practices that are pleasing to God. For we offer intelligible and spiritual sacrifices, devoting to him the fragrance of [724] the virtues, as it were.

10.31 Is Julian then not embarrassed to be mocking the progress towards a superior state that has occurred in life's affairs? Your Excellency, you are committing an injustice, and you love criticizing and are entirely ignorant of what is essential! This too should become clear to every person through what he says next. For he has written as follows:

Julian

> *Now I must take up another point with them: Why do you not practice circumcision? Paul, he says,*[188] *said that "a circumcision of the heart"*[189] *was given but not a circumcision of the flesh, and that this was what applied to Abraham, but not yet the matters pertaining to the flesh;*[190] *he also said he believed the impious words proclaimed by Paul and Peter.*

[186] Gen 3:21. [187] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 76 where the same principle is applied to the offerings of the magi.
[188] On the unspecified subject of the verb φησίν here, see the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).
[189] Rom 2:28–29; 4:9–12; Col 2:8–15.
[190] The GCS editors have placed daggers around the preceding clause as well as the "he said" of the next sentence, marking it as possessing irresolvable textual difficulties. For the variety of suggested emendations of previous editors, see the GCS *apparatus criticus*, along with Masaracchia's apparatus, which favors Oecolampadius, with pp.69–70 of her introduction. We have nonetheless sought to render the text as given in the GCS edition.

Hear once more that God is said to give circumcision in the flesh as a covenant and sign to Abraham: "And this is the covenant that you shall
[725] *keep, between me and you and between your seed throughout their generations: […] you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me and you and between me and your seed."*[191]

And Julian adds to these words the fact that *Christ himself too said it was necessary that the law be kept, saying at one point, "I have not come to abolish the law or the prophets but to fulfil them";*[192] *and again in another place, "Whoever annuls one of the least of these commandments and teaches people to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven."*[193]

So then, Julian says, *given that he has unambiguously commanded that you ought to keep the law and threatened punishment for those who transgress a single commandment, how will you who have, to put it simply, transgressed them all find any kind of defense for yourselves? For,* he says, *it must be the case that either Jesus is a liar or you certainly have failed entirely to observe the law.*[194]

And, in addition, Julian brings an accusation against us on grounds that we neither keep the Sabbath nor indeed sacrifice a lamb in the Jewish manner nor indeed eat unleavened bread over it. And he says *the one excuse you have left for your indolence in this matter is that it is not possible for those who are outside of Jerusalem to sacrifice.*[195]

Cyril

10.32 Now Julian uses many words to discuss all these topics. We,
[726] however, for our part have grouped together the ideas he discusses, to ensure that our book will be free of excessive and useless quibbling. And we must, I think, lead forth the truth in battle against each of his "*insipid*" claims[196] and show that he is once more making a baseless mockery of Christian practices and ideas.[197]

[191] Gen 17:10–12. [192] Matt 5:17. [193] Matt 5:19.

[194] On Julian's claims in this paragraph, see Cook 2000, 292–93.

[195] *c. Gal.* fr. 85 Mas.; Wright 1923, 420–23, 426–27. Julian's reference here to the Christian "excuse" that the Jews were allowed to sacrifice only in Jerusalem might be alluding to Eusebius, *D.e.* 1.3.2–3 (admittedly without precise verbal resonance and so not noted by Bouffartigue [1992, 388], who nonetheless claims a close connection between Julian and the *D.e.* regarding the interpretation of Abel's and Cain's sacrifices at *c. Gal.* fr. 84 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 10.26]). In his edition of *c. Gal.* (p.233.5–8), Neumann joined this sentence with a clause from *c. Iul.* 9.46.4–6 (= *c. Gal.* fr. 76 Mas.) in which Julian (in an apparently positive manner) points out that Elijah sacrificed in a location outside of Jerusalem. Wright's translation followed Neumann (pp.426–27). See also *c. Gal.* fr. 72.11–13 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 9.22.14–16) where Julian comments on the absence of the Jewish temple.

[196] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 84.17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.21). [197] Gk.: τὰ Χριστιανῶν.

It is true that the divine Paul said "*circumcision*" in the flesh "*was given to Abraham*" as "*a sign*" of "his faith while he was uncircumcised."[198] For he was aiming to lower the upraised eyebrow of the Jews and to prove that the justification obtained in faith is older than the instruction in the law, saying quite rightly that justification came to Abraham "not when he was circumcised" but instead "when he was uncircumcised." Nevertheless, even though Paul sufficiently resolved the question of circumcision in this manner, with his usual exceptional skill, he still also knew that it was an image of an intelligible reality. "For," he says, "a person is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is circumcision something outward and done in the flesh. Rather, a person is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision of the heart is in the Spirit not in the letter, and such a person receives praise not from people but from God."[199]

Indeed, come, if it pleases you, and let us investigate what kind of rationale[200] there is for circumcision in the flesh when we remove its mystical aspect. And yet[201] – if it is in fact the case that those categorized as male were better off with a circumcised reproductive organ[202] and if God rejects the foreskin – why did he not instead fashion it in the beginning in the way that pleased him? And, to take another avenue of investigation, in human bodies undamaged by pathology one cannot [727] find anything at all that is either superfluous or deficient, but everything is serviceable, most necessary, and essential by nature, such that, as far as I can tell, a body is not in a correct state unless everything intrinsic to its nature is present. Could it, then, be the case that the Craftsman missed the mark of what was useful and appropriate and that his plans were frustrated only when it came to the human body, given that he, as God, casually improvised[203] the entire rest of the created realm, which is serviceable and without defect in terms of whatever its purpose might be?[204]

[198] In this and the following sentence, Cyril has started with the biblical language present already in the preceding fragment of Julian, but then resorts to more Pauline phrasing not present in Julian's fragment; see Rom 4:9–13.

[199] Rom 2:28–29. [200] Gk.: ὁποῖον … λόγον.

[201] This sentence is an anacolouthon, beginning with one interrogative particle (πῶς), followed immediately by a conditional clause, and then restarting the question with an interrogative pronoun (τί).

[202] Literally "the part of the body that makes children" (τὸ παιδοποιὸν τοῦ σώματος μόριον).

[203] Gk.: ἀποσχεδιάσας.

[204] In the passage above Cyril is making an argument from the lesser to the greater. If the Craftsman "casually improvised" the rest of creation, and all the parts of their bodies are functional and necessary, then surely it is absurd to think that any part of the human body, his most special creation, is defective or superfluous. Cf. *c. Iul.* 1.29.15–24; 1.33.6; 2.28.15.

10.33 What kind of benefit, then, could come from circumcision? Or will some perhaps propose that common and ridiculous rationale which they say is on the lips of both the more ignorant of the Jews as well as the servants of idols? For, they say, in order that the body might appear free of physical pollutions and dirtiness, it is necessary that this part be stripped of the covering put there by nature. But I would say that they are committing a grave injustice by censuring nature given that it contains nothing superfluous or redundant, but in fact fulfils decorum by providing a sort of clothing for the part that seems, in a sense, to be shameful. Yet if they have a strong inclination to run away from the filth of the flesh, how can they endure the flesh and what comes from it and the spring hidden within that produces children? For they should instead have directed their energies against the actual source of contamination, and not hurt the organs through which it passes by cutting them off. Yet the nature of the body does not defile a soul, even if it functions according to its own laws. Being circumcised for reasons of bodily clean-
[728] liness, as these people recommend, is therefore pointless.

If so, then someone might, I imagine, ask, "What is the point of circumcision?" In fact, dear sir, it is beautiful and beneficial, provided that you believe it is a type of an intelligible reality. For in an allusive fashion it indicates the removal of inordinate desires and pleasures that have to do with the human mind, which Christ brought about in us through the Holy Spirit. For an innumerable host of pleasures bewitch the human mind, with some of them diverting it to fleshly devotion while others lead it to feeble and evanescent delights – to inordinate greed, foolish ostentation and, to sum up, every kind of perverse action which even the divine law itself has denounced. It is from all of these that the grace of the Holy Spirit frees us as it inhabits our mind and cuts away every form of uncleanness; this is the circumcision that God desires most of all. The prophet Jeremiah, for example, used the following words to dispute with the Jewish peoples who had little regard
[729] for fulfilling their customary obligations: "Be circumcised to God and circumcise your hardheartedness, O men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem."[205]

10.34 Hence, no one could doubt that, if someone is completely freed of passions in his heart, such a person is quite appropriately circumcised "to God" and not to mere flesh. It was because they could not bear to do this that the God of the universe holds those descended from Israel

[205] Jer 4:4.

highly culpable, saying, "Because all the nations are uncircumcised in the flesh and the entire house of Israel are uncircumcised in their heart."[206] And at one point he also said through the voice of Jeremiah, "To whom shall I speak and bear witness and he will listen? Behold their ears are uncircumcised and they are unable to hear."[207] And indeed, the divine Stephen faults them for their obstinacy and disobedience and says, "You are uncircumcised in your ears and hearts."[208] Paul, who was learned in the law, therefore, said it best: "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing; rather, keeping God's commandments is what matters."[209] [730]

But since Julian is always making a habit of accusing and implicating in bad morals those determined to think correctly, he makes his attack with the following words:

Julian

"Circumcision has to do with your flesh," it says.[210] *"We disobey this command," he says,*[211] *"and we circumcise our hearts."*[212] *Of course you do! For among you will be found no criminal, no scoundrel, so circumcised of heart are you! Well said!*[213] *"We cannot keep the commandment about unleavened bread and perform the Passover," he says. "For Christ has been sacrificed for us once and for all."*[214] *Did he then prevent you from eating unleavened bread?*

And yet, by the gods, I myself am among those who avoid celebrating feasts with the Jews, although I do always worship the god of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob,[215] *who, being Chaldeans and belonging to a sacred race that*

[206] Jer 9:26(25). [207] Jer 6:10. [208] Acts 7:51. [209] 1 Cor 7:19. [210] Cf. Gen 17:11–13.

[211] On the unspecified subject of the verb φησί here, as well as φησίν three lines below, see the note on *c. Gal.* fr. 83 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.22).

[212] Cf. Rom 2:29.

[213] On Julian's sarcastic criticism of Christian morality, cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 59 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.38), where he similarly attacks baptism.

[214] Cf. 1 Cor 5:7–8; Heb 9:28; 1 Pet 3:18.

[215] In a letter to Theodorus, the high priest of Asia, Julian also expressed his devotion to the Jewish god, saying that the Jews, at least "in part," are "god-fearing," insofar as they worship a god who is "truly most powerful and most good and administers the world of sense, whom I well know we too worship with other names" (*Ep.* 89a [pp.154.14–155.3 Bidez] [= *Ep.* 20 (pp.60–61 Wright)]). Such respect for the Jewish deity no doubt partially accounts for Julian's attempt to rebuild the Jewish temple in Jerusalem, and the legitimacy of traditional Jewish piety served as a useful weapon in his attack upon Christianity. See Bradbury 2020, 277–78; Finkelstein 2018, 63–64, 129–30; Ritter 2020, 16–18. Finkelstein argues that this letter once formed part of Julian's *c. Gal.*, but this is an unnecessary and unprovable hypothesis. See also Julian's more disparaging comments about Jewish conceptions of God in comparison with Hellenic theology at *c. Gal.* frs. 25; 28 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.38; 4.46).

[731] *practiced theurgy,*[216] *learned circumcision while sojourning among the Egyptians,*[217] *but revered a god who has shown kindness to me and to those who revere him, just as Abraham revered him, since he is very great and powerful, but he has nothing to do with you. For you do not imitate Abraham, by raising up altars for him and building sacrificial altars and worshipping him, as they did, with sacrifices.*[218]

Cyril

10.35 So then, good sir, will those deeds that are excellent above all else lose their good standing in your eyes simply because certain people responded to them incorrectly? Is there any good that is of equal weight to circumcision in the Spirit and can anything rival it? Will you then declare that which is so exceptional and useful to be wicked? Does that which frees us from all uncleanness seem to you to be pointless and reprehensible? "For," he says, "there are in fact many *among you who are criminals and scoundrels*."[219] Yet isn't this state of affairs naturally an indictment, not of circumcision, but rather of those who are not habituated to following the best way of life? For do you deny that the benefit of medical expertise is most useful and essential for all the inhabitants of the earth, taming as it does the ferocity of our pathologies? Nevertheless, even though the person skilled in this area bestows his assistance upon the sick, still those who cede inevitable victory to their undisciplined appetites rush headlong into that which causes them pain and thereby fight against the medical art, with the result that what is able to save
[732] them even seems to be useless. Should we, then, who have opted to hold correct and just ideas, conclude that medical expertise is impotent? Or should we say that those who resist the treatment are themselves the

[216] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 54.9 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 7.9.15), where Julian mentions the claim that Solomon was trained in theurgy. After Iamblichus (if not before), it became a commonplace among Neoplatonic philosophers that the Chaldeans were an ancient and wise nation who practiced theurgy, as evidenced by the high esteem they accorded to the *Chaldean Oracles*. See Edwards 2006, 117–26; Finamore and Johnston 2010; or more cautiously, Johnson 2013, 103–04, 141–44, 266–70. Celsus too had held the Chaldeans to be among "the most inspired races" (see Origen, *Cels*. 6.80). For Julian's other references to theurgy or theurgists, see *ad deor. matr.* 12.173a; 18.178d; 20.180b; *c. Her.* 14.219b; *Ep*. 89b (p.159.21–22 Bidez) (= "Letter to a Priest" [pp.306–07 Wright]). See Tanaseanu-Döbler 2013, 136–48; Finkelstein 2018, 107–08.

[217] On the patriarchs as Chaldeans, cf. Gen 11:28, 31. Celsus similarly said that the Hebrews picked up circumcision from the Egyptians (see Origen, *Cels*. 1.22; 5.41).

[218] *c. Gal.* fr. 86 Mas.; Wright 1923, 422–23.

[219] This is precisely the opposite of what Julian said in *c. Gal.* fr. 86.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.34.20). Julian's remark, however, was no doubt sarcastic, and Cyril is accordingly responding to the real intent of his words.

reason they do not experience any of the benefits that come from it? For while the art of medicine was able to assist them in their suffering, they were nevertheless overcome by their own pleasures and utterly failed to obtain the good things that come from it. In light of this, why does Julian bring accusations against the God-given circumcision in the Spirit simply because there are some people who, generally speaking, are among our number, who have chosen the impure manner of life instead of the one that is pure and, by their own fault, nullify that thrice-desired and much prayed for gift that so fittingly belongs to the generosity from above?[220]

Those from Israel slaughtered the lamb; they consumed unleavened bread with it in accord with the ancient prescriptions of the law, but, as I said, intelligible realities were depicted for the ancients in shadows.[221] The truth has shone forth, since Christ, the true lamb, who is the truly sacred and undefiled sacrifice, has been slaughtered for us. We have given up the types, since the present season calls us to do so. We have made our food [733]
the purest thing of all – I mean the food that comes through the evangelical oracles – and among us the task of putting off, in an intelligible sense, all leaven – that is, diabolical evil – has become a serious and important undertaking. Hence, as I said, though we have ceased practicing what was presented in types, we fulfil the true worship. For "the fulfillment of the law" and the prophets is Christ,[222] who was not being deceitful when he said, "I have not come to abolish the law but to fulfill it."[223] And again, "I say to you, not the smallest letter, not the least pen stroke, will pass from the law until everything comes to pass."[224] For just as preliminary outlines[225] sketched[226] on tablets are hardly destroyed when the whole range of colors are added at the appropriate time but instead are transformed into a more realistic picture, in the same way we hold that the shadows of the law were not overturned but instead were brought to their goal as though they had been progressing towards the

[220] Macarius Magnes responds similarly to the anonymous Hellene's criticism of baptism at *Apocr.* 4.25.24–26.

[221] This is the topic to which much of the previous book is devoted. See *c. Iul.* 9.13–47; 10.23–25.

[222] Cf. Rom 10:4. [223] Matt 5:17. [224] Matt 5:18.

[225] Both the words "outlines" and "shadows" in this sentence translate the same Greek word σκιά, which can have either sense. As a stage in a process of creating a drawing or painting, "outline" is clearly a more appropriate translation but when used in contrast to the "light of Christ" that has shone forth at his incarnation, "shadow" is more apt. Cyril's analogy therefore picks up both senses of the term.

[226] Gk.: προανατυπουμένας.

truth,[227] assuming that they, being pregnant with the beauty of the truth,
[734] reached this point at the appropriate time when Christ shone forth.

10.36 Julian should, therefore, acquit us of this indictment and the charge that we do not stick to the types and indeed are not in the habit of celebrating feasts in a Jewish fashion, given that our practices have come into a superior state. But if he is vexed at this fact and regards progress in the realm of practices – I mean progress towards what is better – as something contemptible, it is arguably time for him impiously to rebuke also all the other practices throughout life that have undergone improvement towards a better condition, something that an examination of each case would demonstrate is true.

Furthermore, Julian feigns the appearance of someone who is pious and says he reveres the God of Abraham and that he is great and powerful, probably meaning that he too is one of those "*particular*"[228] gods honored in specific places and regions, whom he frequently calls "*city-guarding*" and indeed also "*ethnarchs*."[229] Hence, it seems to me that with great cunning he slips into the appearance of showing reverence to God, when in fact he does not believe he is the one true God by nature over all, but instead places him among the number of his own gods.[230]

Moreover, Julian again brings a charge against us for not fulfilling our sacred duty to God by "*raising up altars*" like the divine Abraham did. For, he says, "*you do not imitate* him," not realizing that we in fact abound with a true and essential similarity to his habits, since, though we
[735] are uncircumcised as of course he too was, we have believed in God and have been justified, just as happened to him too.[231] For it is written, "And Abraham believed God and it was considered as his justice."[232] And we too are considered as his children <and> have made it our aim to emulate <him>. For we ourselves also sacrifice, in a better manner now than he did then, since the types used to prevail at the time appropriate for types, but, now that the truth[233] has been exhibited, the true worship must prevail.

[227] The section of this paragraph beginning with the allusion to Rom 10:4 and extending up to this footnote (= *c. Iul.* 10.35.36–44), though excluding the citation of Matt 5:18, was excerpted and included in the catena tradition on Romans, along with passages from *c. Iul.* 9.31.1–5 and 9.40.8–16. See Cyril, *Rom*. 10:4 (235.24–31 Pusey).

[228] Gk.: μερικῶν.

[229] Cf. *c. Gal.* frs. 21.9; 26.2–3; 28.5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.2.11–12, 14; 4.40.4; 4.46.7–8, 12).

[230] At *c. Gal.* fr. 28 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 4.46) Julian indeed entertains the possibility that Moses' god is but one ethnarch deity among the multitude of gods, and not a very important one, since he "has been allotted control of the tiniest portion" of the earth.

[231] Cf. Rom 4:11. [232] Gen 15:6; Rom 4:3. [233] Cf. John 14:6.

10.37 In addition to this, Julian disparages the divine Abraham and indeed says,

Julian[234]

For just like us Abraham too was always sacrificing without ceasing. Moreover, he used divination based on shooting stars – this too is equally a Greek practice – and even more he practiced augury from birds while also having over his household a steward who was able to interpret signs.[235] *And if any of you don't believe me, I will highlight the very things said by Moses on this point: "And after these words, the Lord's word came to Abraham speaking in a vision in the night: 'Do not be afraid, Abraham; I am protecting you. Your reward will be* [736] *exceedingly great.' But Abraham was saying, 'Master, what will you give me? I am passing away childless and the son of Masek, my homebred servant, will be my heir.' And immediately the voice of God came to him saying, 'He shall not be your heir but the one who is to come forth from you, he will be your heir.' And he led him outside and said to him, 'Look up into the sky and number the stars, if you are able to count them.' And he said, 'So shall your offspring be.' And Abraham believed God and it was considered as his justice."*[236]

Tell me, on the basis of this passage, why did the angel or god with whom he was negotiating lead him outside and show him the stars? Didn't he know, while he was still inside, how great is the multitude of stars that are always visible and twinkle at night? Yes he did, but in my view he wanted to show him shooting stars in order that he might set forth as a clear assurance of his words the verdict of heaven, which ordains and sanctions all things.[237]

Cyril

10.38 Now it is true that the divine Abraham was devoted to sacrifice and was extremely pious, though it was not in keeping with the custom of the Greeks that he used to carry out his sacred rites. For while they have ascribed honors to unclean spirits, he, albeit in a manner still befitting the types and gross materiality of Jewish worship, nevertheless was [737] zealously making offerings and erecting altars throughout the land to the one who is truly God by nature.

[234] The *Catena on Genesis* preserves a fragment of Theodore of Mopsuestia's response to this passage of Julian's *Against the Galileans* in his own *Against Julian*, which is almost entirely lost. See Theodore, *c. Iul.* fr. 2 Guida.

[235] Gk.: συμβολικόν. Cf. the story of Abraham's servant finding a wife for Isaac in Gen 24, discussed below by Cyril at *c. Iul.* 10.41.

[236] Gen 15:1–6. [237] *c. Gal.* fr. 87 Mas.; Wright 1923, 422–25.

But Julian is probably thinking this man used divination and investigated[238] the courses of the stars on the assumption that they sometimes indicate some essential matter. But this is in fact an accusation against the folly of the Greeks and is nothing more than a juvenile game and pointless quackery. Contrary to what he says, the all-wise Abraham did not practice divination in any form. And one can observe what I am saying from the very simplicity with which the sacred writings recount this episode. For on reaching senescence, the old man began to lament his childlessness, even though he did have an illegitimate child named Ishmael. But the God who is all-powerful promised him offspring from a free woman that would rival the stars and grow to a multitude beyond counting. For he showed him the stars and said, "So shall your offspring be."[239] Hence, anyone who wants to can see that the stars were taken as a clear illustration of this immeasurable multitude. Furthermore, nowhere is it said that he saw shooting stars or stars that confirmed the promise by their courses and intimated something hidden with God by their shifting
[738] positions. So why else would he have been called out to view them, so that he might be told at that perfectly timed moment, "So shall your offspring be"?

And that most excellent man is giving his untested speculation the force of truth when he says, "*Yes he did, but in my view he wanted to show him shooting stars in order that he might set forth as a clear assurance of his words the verdict of heaven, which ordains and sanctions all things.*"[240] Very well. For no future event escapes the notice of you people who have been educated in "*shooting stars*" and in "*the verdict of heaven*" that "*ordains all things*"! Do you see these people running workshops of deceit[241] and market stalls selling lies? They are nearly always marveling at shooting stars, sometimes telling people the mysteries in the heavens in exchange for pennies, and, by taking weak women captive and beguiling the mind of the common herd, they fatten their own wallets, or rather, their petty theft yields tiny profits and they try to scrape together a wage for themselves in exchange for their insipid fantasies, even though, as the adversary of truth claims, by the movement of the stars they apparently discover "*the verdict of heaven*" that "*ordains all things*." But they would be convicted as quacks and liars who know nothing of what is true. "For," as it has been written, "who has known the mind of the Lord?"[242]

[238] Gk.: περιεργάζεσθαι. [239] Gen 15:5. [240] See *c. Gal.* fr. 87.19–21 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.37.23–25).
[241] Cyril is perhaps deliberately echoing Julian's earlier claim that the apostles were running "workshops of magical trickery and loathsome behavior" at *c. Gal.* fr. 82.10–11 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.17.12–13).
[242] Rom 11:34.

Now we maintain that the chorus of the stars has not been made by him to be invested with the dignity of the holy prophets, nor indeed for any other purpose besides merely "giving light" to those "upon earth" and also serving as signs "of the seasons." For the sacred scripture serves as a witness to this fact.[243] Julian is, therefore, randomly twittering away and drawing futile inferences when he says Abraham used the stars for divination. For we hold that it was not in fact shooting stars that were pointed out to him but rather their vast number. For it says, "So shall your offspring be."[244] [739]

10.39 In addition, Julian says [Abraham] "*practiced augury from birds,*"[245] writing as follows:

Julian

And lest someone suppose that such an interpretation is forced, I will convince him by setting forth the text that immediately follows. For next is written, "And he said to him, 'I am the God who brought you out of the land of the Chaldeans, so as to give you this land for you to inherit it.' And he said, 'Master, Lord, how will I know that I will inherit it?' And he said to him, 'Take for me a three-year-old heifer and a three-year-old goat and a three-year-old ram and a turtledove and a dove.' And he took all these for him and divided them in the middle and placed them facing one another, but he did not divide the birds. And birds came down upon the cut halves and Abraham sat with them."[246] *Behold how the preceding proclamation of the angel or god who appeared to him was confirmed by means of augury from birds, while the divination was carried out with sacrifices and not treated as a mere sideshow, as it is with us.*[247] [740]

Moreover, [Julian] says,[248] "*He showed that the promise was reliable by means of the birds flying down onto it.*"

And [Julian] accepts Abraham's faith, adding, "*Faith in the absence of the truth seems to be a sort of folly and madness. And it is not possible <to see>*[249] *the truth from a mere statement; rather it is necessary that some sort of clear*

[243] See Gen 1:14–18; cf. *c. Iul.* 3.40.

[244] Gen 15:5. Cyril will return to the topic of the Chaldeans and astral divination at *c. Iul.* fr. 3a.

[245] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 87.3–4 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.37.6). [246] Gen 15:7–11.

[247] The surviving Greek manuscripts of *c. Iul.* read ὑμεῖς ("you") here and this is the reading given in prior editions of both *c. Gal.* and *c. Iul.*, but the GCS edition has emended the text in light of Oecolampadius' translation, which has *nos* ("us").

[248] The subject of the verb here (φησί) and the first verb of the next paragraph (ἀποδέχεται; "he accepts") is ambiguous and some editors have regarded these lines of text as coming from Julian. We follow the GCS editors in viewing the opening words of both these paragraphs as Cyril introducing passages from Julian.

[249] Neumann supplied the verb ἰδεῖν here, an emendation followed by Masaracchia and the GCS edition.

sign should accompany the words, a sign that, by its occurrence, will confirm the prediction made regarding the future."[250]

Cyril

10.40 In this passage once more the faith of the sacred scriptures has been hawked about.[251] For he redirects the import of the ideas they contain towards what he and he alone has – I don't know how – conjectured without any reflection at all. Indeed, I believe he has experienced the sort of thing that might frequently happen to those who focus their gaze upon the clouds darting across the sky.[252] For those who habitually do this think
[741] they sometimes see things like centaurs and lions and indeed even humans, as their mind creates the shapes of such things and, as it were, imprints upon the outlines[253] of clouds something that isn't actually there.[254]

I, however, think the task before me is to clarify the sense of the divine scripture for my audience. For this is the only way they can come to recognize that once more he is speaking "*insipid*" nonsense.[255] For the God of the universe had promised to grant to Abraham a land that would soon be full of his offspring and would be suitable as a habitation for them. But, since the magnitude of the promise seemed somehow to surpass what could be hoped for – for unexpected events also have a tendency to be disbelieved[256] – he requested a sign, continuing with the words, "Master, how will I know this?"[257] Now the old man ought not to have doubted in any way at all, since it was God who was speaking to him. Yet because he was still in the initial stages of having faith, God came down to his level, establishing in him a sturdy basis and foundation for piety, and from his inherent and exceedingly great tranquility he decided to confirm the promise with an oath, bestowing on one who was weak something that would remedy faintheartedness.[258]

[250] *c. Gal.* fr. 88 Mas.; Wright 1923, 424–27.

[251] Gk.: ἐκκεκαπήλευται. The same complaint was made against the Christian Origen by the pagan Porphyry; see *Chr.* fr. 6 Becker (= Eusebius, *H.e.* 6.19.7), with commentary at Becker 2016, 158–59.

[252] The term used here for "darting across the sky" (διαττούσαις) is the same one that Julian and Cyril had applied to stars, which we have translated as "shooting stars."

[253] Gk.: σκιαῖς (literally, "shadows").

[254] Cf. Aristophanes, *Nu.* 346–7, where centaur-shaped clouds are also mentioned. Diodorus Siculus reported certain myths in which centaurs came into existence by the mating of Ixion with a cloud shaped by Zeus to appear like Hera (4.69.5).

[255] Cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 84.17 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.26.21). [256] Cf. *c. Iul.* frs. 7; 19. [257] Gen 15:8.

[258] Cyril's exegesis of this biblical passage contrasts sharply with that of Augustine, who denied that Abraham experienced any doubt and interpreted the elements of the ceremony in allegorical fashion (*C. D.* 16.24).

Now the Chaldeans had a custom that those oaths which were to be more secure than usual should be made by having the persons pass through "cut halves," a practice that was sanctioned by their local law.[259] [742] This is what God is commanding Abraham to do when he says, "Take for me a three-year-old heifer and a three-year-old goat and a three-year-old ram and a turtledove and a dove."[260] Because the divine Abraham understood this quite well, even though the only command God gave him was to take the animals, he himself added the rest and, in keeping with the custom about oath-making, he began cutting them in two and placing the slaughtered animals in rows, as though God was at any moment about to dart through the middle of them.[261]

Even up to the present day one can see certain oaths like this being made among the barbarians or even among some of those who lived in ancient times. Sophocles, for example, in the *Antigone* has one of the messengers assigned to guard the body of Polynices say the following to the person who ruled over Thebes (this was Creon):

> And we were ready to take even red-hot iron into our hands
> And to walk through fire and to swear oaths by the gods.[262]

For passing through the middle of fire and "taking red-hot iron into their hands" is how they used to make oaths.

Therefore, as I said, the God of the universe actually came down to the level of the old man's faintheartedness and, by way of accommodation,[263] he framed the oath in accordance with the practice of the Chaldeans. For the text says that, as the sun was "setting," "torches of fire" passed [743] through "the middle of the cut halves."[264] And once again the divine and undefiled nature was represented in the form of fire. Julian neglected to mention this part of the account because, in my view at least, he was afraid of being refuted, though for our part we have added it in order to provide some benefit by proving that the cut halves were actually used for the purpose of the oath instead of being, as Julian says, some sort of sacrifice performed according to "*the methods*" of divination.

10.41 Furthermore, if it is the case that those birds that are most detestable, with an instinct for eating flesh, flew down upon the sacrifices and that Abraham then scared them off, what, dear sir, is so

[259] Cyril offers a similar interpretation of this episode at *Glaph. Gen.* 3 (PG 69.120ad).
[260] Gen 15:9.
[261] Cf. Procopius of Gaza, *Gen.* 15.3, lines 113–18 Metzler, which seems to summarize the preceding paragraph and the final sentence of the previous paragraph (*c. Iul.* 10.40.19–33).
[262] Sophocles, *Ant.* 264–65. Cyril is apparently the first author to cite these lines of the play.
[263] Greek: οἰκονομικῶς. [264] Gen 15:17.

strange about that? For it was inappropriate for the items used for the purpose of the oath to be cast aside to be mistreated by those most detestable of birds, especially given that the oaths had not yet been completed.

Furthermore, to Julian's statement that "*Faith in the absence of the truth seems to be a sort of folly and madness,*"[265] we say, first of all, good sir, what is taken on faith must not be subjected to scrutiny.[266] For how could something subjected to testing still have been a matter of faith? Nevertheless, the quality of truth had been added to his faith. For the descent of foul and detestable birds upon the sacrifices was not something even better than oaths; rather, his faith was more steadfast as a result of being accompanied by the certainty arising from the oaths.

Moreover, Julian claims Abraham had a servant who was also "*able to interpret signs*,"[267] having been led to this view based on the following event.[268] The divine Abraham selected one member of his household and commanded him to go to Mesopotamia and bring back a bride for Isaac
[744] and to search for a companion for him from among his relatives. [The servant] wanted to carry out the command in all its details and, in keeping with his master's wishes, when he arrived in Haran (this was Abraham's first city) he sent up a prayer and asked God to help him do this. For he understood quite well that his master was predisposed to acts of generosity towards those who visited him from a foreign land. For he valued hospitality above all else. Thus, he was searching for a girl who had the same kind of character and was not at all selfish,[269] lest she should somehow spoil the old man's reputation if it turned out that she had a different mindset from his own. There is another explanation as well: a good and mild-mannered mistress, one who abounds in generosity, is nearly always a welcome godsend for the servants of a household,[270] but a stingy and malicious mistress is avoided and abhorred. But

[265] *c. Gal.* fr. 88.20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.39.18–19).
[266] Gk.: ἀπολυπραγμόνητον.
[267] *c. Gal.* fr. 87.4–5 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.37.6–7).
[268] For what follows, cf. Gen 24:1–61. The word translated here as "devoted to discerning signs" is συμβολικός. In his *Questions on the Octateuch*, Theodoret also rejected the idea put forward by "some" (τινες) that the prayer of Abraham's servant in this passage was offered συμβολικῶς, though it is not clear whether he had in mind Julian or someone else (*Qu. in Gen.* 75).
[269] Gk.: ἀφθονωτάτην, literally "most free from envy." Cyril's concept of "envy" (φθόνος), already important in earlier books of *c. Iul.* (see e.g., 2.37), not only conveyed the frame of mind that desired something another person has, but also the refusal to share with another person a good that one already possesses.
[270] Precisely this sentiment is offered by a slave at Euripides, *Alc.* 769–71.

since knowing hearts would be appropriate only to the God who is over all, the servant begged him many times to point out to him a good and hospitable virgin whose character agreed with that of his master. Thus, as he was praying, he said, "Let this be the person for whom I am searching, the one who, when asked, gives me a drink, with a complete lack of selfishness." For in this way, the woman's mindset could be ascertained and her action could be taken as a sort of pledge of the qualities he could expect in the future. Hence, the one who knows "hearts and minds"[271] pointed the girl out to him. Therefore, Julian should not say the servant "*was able to interpret signs*" just because he asked in prayer that God show him the woman who was like-minded to his master, I mean to Abraham and to the child born from him. Since we too in the present day, if we are in fact astute and devoted to God, hasten to make [745] the God who rules over the universe a colleague and helper in all our affairs and we look to him to discover what path we should follow for every undertaking; yet no one would say that in making this kind of request we are practicing divination with signs but would instead praise our reverence for God.

10.42 Julian, however, says the call of birds was given to him as well, instructing him that he would sit on the imperial throne. O how exceedingly wise are Julian's prophets![272] Presumably the calls of jays and blackbirds, and I should add plovers too (for the sparrow is especially loquacious), gave him a foretaste of such august and transcendent deeds![273] But let the flocks of birds twitter away about whatever they please to those bent on thinking like he does, since deception is ever dear to them. As

[271] Cf. Ps 7:10(9).

[272] The first two sentences of this paragraph (= *c. Iul.* 10.42.1–3) were included by Masaracchia as *c. Gal.* fr. 89. Julian's reliance on divination at key points of his career is well established in the historical record; but Cyril's paraphrase here of Julian's statement is too vague to allow one to identify when he received this specific divine message beyond the simple fact that it must have been prior to his becoming sole emperor in 361. One likely context was while Julian was still in Gaul and trying to decide whether to march east to face Constantius. According to Eunapius, during this period Julian summoned Nestorius, the Hierophant of Eleusis, and they together performed secret rites that prompted Julian to set out to destroy "the tyranny of Constantius" (*VS* 7.3.7). Ammianus (21.1.6) and Gregory of Nazianzus (*Or.* 4.47) similarly say that Julian made his move against Constantius because he had assurance of the outcome of events through divination, though without specifying what kind. In the course of providing an overview of the various methods of divination, Ammianus mentions divination by birds at 21.1.9; at 22.1.1 he specifically says Julian was using this method while in Illyricum before receiving news of Constantius' death. Sozomon has Julian engaged in divining his future even before departing for Gaul, while still in the East (*H.e.* 5.2.18–19), so the event Julian was alluding to in *c. Gal.* could have occurred during this earlier period as well. See Kaldellis 2005.

[273] Bird augury was also criticized in Origen, *Cels.* 4.89–91.

for us, however, we "have bid a long farewell to the birds circling overhead,"[274] and we assign omniscience solely to the God who rules over the universe, holding that he alone is the Emperor and Lord of heaven and earth, the Craftsman of things visible and invisible, sensible and intelligible. For he brought into existence from nonexistence that which
[746] formerly did not exist, doing so through the Son, through whom and with whom be glory to God the Father, along with the Holy Spirit forever. Amen.

[274] The first part of this sentence is an almost verbatim quotation of Euripides, *Hipp.* 1058–59. Cyril cites the same passage at greater length in a similar discussion of divination by birds at *Ador.* 6 (PG 68.469a). In Euripides' play the words are spoken by King Theseus, who suffers the tragedy of condemning his own son to death because he did not take care to seek the counsel of the gods through divination. Cyril's decision to make the words of the tragic king his own is, therefore, a rather creative appropriation of the original line.

Fragments

From Book 11

Fragment 1[1]

Sacra: Letter omicron, concerning conceit and appearance, and that being is better than seeming; for this is a hindrance to virtue[2]
From the eleventh book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> That saying of the prophet is true which goes, "The conceited[3] and spiteful person – a boastful man – will not likely bring anything to completion."[4] For "conceit cuts progress short," according to that common statement that is on the lips of many people.[5]

[1] The GCS edition includes what are considered true fragments of Cyril's *c. Iul.*, as well as *testimonia* that do not preserve his precise words, and it distinguishes between the two by placing text that is presumed to be Cyril's own words in a larger font. For our presentation, we have indented the text where it is a matter of an unambiguous fragment of the work, while *testimonia* are aligned to the left margin.

[2] The enormous florilegium known as the *Sacra* collects extracts from various authors under thematic headings, arranged alphabetically. Following the GCS edition, we include the heading under which each of the fragments from *Against Julian* appears. On the *Sacra*, see further Kinzig and Brüggemann, GCS 21, 750–54. We have corrected the GCS edition's mistaken attribution of this fragment to the section of the *Sacra* entitled Στοιχεῖον Ο, Περὶ ὀνόματος χρηστοῦ ("Letter omicron, concerning a good name"), which is in fact the subsequent section of the collection (beginning on p.903 Thum). The correct section of the *Sacra* in which this and the next fragment appear is titled Περὶ οἰήσεως καὶ δοκήσεως, καὶ ὅτι κρεῖττον τὸ εἶναι τοῦ δοκεῖν· ἐμπόδιον γὰρ τοῦτο πρὸς ἀρετήν (beginning on p.891 Thum, with these fragments being designated II[1]1626–27 on p.899), which is the heading translated above. A further fragment from this same section appears below as fr. 56 from book 18 of *c. Iul.*, which also has the incorrect section heading in the GCS edition. We are grateful to Jonathan Zecher for drawing this to our attention.

[3] Cyril's text of Habakkuk reads ὁ κατοιόμενος ("the conceited person"), while the LXX has ὁ κατοινωμένος ("the drunk person"). He seemingly was unaware of the LXX reading and picks up on the word κατοιόμενος in the next sentence with his mention of οἴησις ("conceit").

[4] Hab 2:5.

[5] This saying was attributed to Heraclitus in the Paris Gnomology (R109 [Laks/Most]). Philo said it came from "the ancients" (*QG.* 3, fr. 48), while Diogenes Laertius attributed it to the philosopher Bion (4.50.7). It was also mentioned by Cyril's contemporary Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* 1647.3–4).

Fragment 2

Sacra: Letter omicron,[6] concerning conceit and appearance, and that being is better than seeming; for this is a hindrance to virtue
From the same:

> Conceit cuts progress short. For when someone admits his ignorance one may more easily draw his attention towards what he has not yet discerned; however, for someone who has the appearance of knowledge and is arrogant < … > the fact that he seems to be knowledgeable renders him altogether foolish and completely ignorant. For he does not accept the
> [762] words of his teachers.

Fragment 3a [pp.762–63, 878][7]

Belonging to Saint Cyril, from the eleventh book of *Against Julian the Pagan*:

> And, O friend of ours, what is so novel about the fact that, in keeping with God's will, a star arose contrary to its normal pattern at that time when God the Word took on a body and it went ahead as a herald?[8] Is it not the case that, due to the occurrence of great events all throughout the world, those stars have often appeared that are also called "comets" or "bearded," though others also give them the name "meteors"?[9] And this star was not one of those known stars, nor was it, as [Julian] claims, the daystar.[10] For it rose in the sky for two years, all the while showing the birth of the Messiah in the body.

[6] As with the heading for fr. 1 above (see note), we diverge from the GCS text here.

[7] For those passages that survive in Syriac, we give two sets of page numbers to the GCS edition, the first corresponding to the German translation and the second to the Syriac text upon which it, along with our English translation, is based.

[8] Cyril's response to Julian suggests that he had attacked the story of the magi's star on grounds that it was "novel" (ܚܕܬܐ), perhaps as a reaction to the treatment of the story in Origen, *Cels*. 1.58 and Eusebius, *D.e.* 9.1.11–13, who had both argued that the star was a "new" heavenly object. See Cook 2000, 290.

[9] The Syriac word here (ܩܕܝܣ) is treated by the German translation as unintelligible and so is transliterated as *'qdys* with a parenthetical speculation that it could be a corruption of the Greek word ἀκοντισμός (GCS 21, 762.8), which means "emission" and was sometimes used to refer to shooting stars (LSJ, s.v. ἀκοντισμός, A.2). However, if the prefixed ܒ is taken not as a preposition (as the German transliteration suggests) but as a part of the word itself, then it can be read as a standard transliteration of the Greek word δοκίδες meaning "meteors" (cf. PS, s.v. ܒܩܕܝܣ; LSJ, s.v. δοκίς, II), as it is also taken in Neumann 1880a, 65 and Masaracchia 1990, 185. For a representative passage see Ps-Aristotle, *Mu.* 4.395b13. See also the similar problem in fr. 3b below with note.

[10] Neumann excerpted the previous sentence for his edition of *c. Gal.*, and Masaracchia excerpted the previous two as *c. Gal.* fr. 91. For an argument that Masaracchia's excerpt should be expanded

And because, among the Chaldeans and above all among the magi, it was regarded as a very important custom to track the precise movements of the stars, since they treated such phenomena as an oracle, people saw a star in the East running its course whose movement changed as it went from the East as far as Judea.[11] And in keeping with their custom, they imagined that some illustrious king had been born.[12] However, since they did not realize it was concealing the mystery of Christ, they thought that instead it was a man who had been born in the kingdom of Judea. And they came and said, "Where is the king of the Jews who has been born?"[13] Herod was alarmed and asked them when the star had appeared to them, and, after he learned that it had arisen two years prior, he ordered the killing of all the boys in Bethlehem from two years old and under.[14] For he thought he would seize him among those he destroyed in his cruelty, although the magi discovered the child in swaddling clothes having just been born and not yet eight days old, and having not yet gone up to Jerusalem for them to offer sacrifices as the law commands.[15]

So then, this is how the marvel should be understood and it is worthy of being believed, even if that star did not remain until now.[16] Moreover, it was not one of the stars that are known – not the daystar or the Pleiades or Aldebaran. And even if it was standing over Bethlehem and over the house and over the place where the child was lying, one should not doubt the story but should instead marvel at God's miraculous signs which were rightly done for the conversion of those who were in error. For the magi were the first fruits of the calling of the nations and this is a clear manifestation that henceforth the power of Satan was shaken and his weapons were being seized from him.

to include more material here relevant for reconstructing Julian's argument, see Crawford 2023a, 854–59. Julian's comparison of the magi's star with the daystar or Venus might have been drawing upon the tradition recorded by Varro that Venus was the only star ever to have changed its course (= Augustine, *C. D.* 21.8) and/or that Venus moved from east to west guiding Aeneas on his journey as founder of Rome (= Servius, *Commentary on the Aeneid of Virgil* 2.801). For further discussion, see Crawford 2023a, 857–58. In his treatise *De rerum praenotione*, Gian Francesco Pico della Mirandola claimed Julian compared the magi's star to an Egyptian comet named "Asaph," which is otherwise not mentioned in surviving ancient sources. It is unclear what source Pico was drawing upon for his information about Julian, but his testimony is in keeping with Julian's intent in the above passage to identify the star with a known heavenly body. See Guida 2020, 98. Riedweg 2020a, 261 proposes that Pico's testimony be designated *c. Gal.* fr. 91a.

[11] Cf. Matt 2:1–2, 9.

[12] On Chaldeans and astral divination, see also Julian's discussion of Abraham in *c. Gal.* fr. 87 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 10.37), and Cyril's response in *c. Iul.* 10.38.

[13] Matt 2:2. [14] Cf. Matt 2:3, 16. [15] Cf. Luke 2:21–39.

[16] This sentence, which was not included in *c. Gal.* fr. 91 Mas., suggests that Julian's attempt to discredit the story of the magi's star relied in some way upon the fact that the star did not remain in the sky.

Fragment 3b [pp.764–65, 879]

George of B'eltan, *Commentary on Matthew*, Vat. syr. 154, ff.21v b, 22v b – 23r a

And regarding the time of the star's appearance, John [Chrysostom] in *The Explanation of the Gospel* and Cyril in the [books] *Against Julian* say that long before our Savior's birth the star appeared to the magi so that they might meet him not more than eight days after his birth, as Cyril says. But they both say that the magi found him in a manger in a cave wrapped in swaddling clothes … .

It is clear that it was not a natural star but was one of the exalted and intelligent powers. John, Cyril, and Theodotus of Ancyra agree about this.[17] But Julian the pagan said this story of the star is not true because none of the astrologers knew this star, since it did not exist.[18]

But he ought to have known that if those stars that are called "corporeal" and *aqidnos*[19] and "bearded" appeared on account of great events, it was not out of order that, in keeping with God's will, a star should arise contrary to its normal pattern at the time of the birth of God the Word[20] and announce his birth in advance, though in fact it was not a star but one of the eight rational powers. Still, [God] drew [the magi] by means of the appearance of a star, stooping down to their weakness so that he might call them by means of things familiar to them, just as he had announced to Saul his death and the death of his son by means of a witch.[21]

[17] Cf. John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Mt.* 6.2 (PG 57.64); Theodotus of Ancyra, *Hom.* 1 (ACO 1.1.2, pp.87.33–88.3). In the florilegium that contains *c. Iul.* fr. 3a, these two passages are quoted on either side of the extract from Cyril. George was therefore perhaps reliant solely upon that florilegium for his knowledge of Cyril's work, in which case this passage is merely his own reworking of *c. Iul.* fr. 3a. On this florilegium, preserved exclusively in the lacunose manuscript British Library Add. 17214, see Kaufhold's discussion in GCS 21, 823–24.

[18] This passage is not included in Masaracchia's edition of Julian's *c. Gal.*, though Riedweg 2020a, 261 has suggested it be numbered *c. Gal.* fr. 91b. Dionysius bar Salibi, in his *Commentarii in Evangelia*, later mentions this criticism from Julian. Cf. Sedlácek and Chabot 1906, 100–01 (Syriac text); and ibid., 75–76 (Latin translation). Bar Salibi was perhaps drawing upon George's commentary, since he repeats all three of the criticisms from Julian recorded by George (cf. *c. Iul.* frs. 75; 76).

[19] Syriac: ܐܩܕܢܘܣ, which the German translation (GCS 21, 764.16) transliterates, since it is not recognizable as a Syriac word, adding a parenthetical remark that it could be a corruption of the Greek word ἀκοντισμός meaning "emission" and sometimes used to refer to shooting stars (LSJ, s.v. ἀκοντισμός, A.2). See the related issue in fr. 3a above and the note *ad loc*.

[20] Though he does not acknowledge it, George here is repeating verbatim a line from Cyril (*c. Iul.* fr. 3a [878.2–3 Kaufhold] = *c. Iul.* fr. 3b [879.12 Kaufhold]).

[21] Cf. 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 28:19.

Fragment 4 [pp.765, 879]

That the body of Christ needed to grow. From the eleventh book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*, from question six:[22]

> The holy virgin was mindful of the words of Gabriel. But since the body of Christ needed to grow, she did not accurately understand the mystery about him.[23]

Fragment 5

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning God's power and that no one is sufficient to stand against God's might
From the eleventh book of Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> Nothing at all is impossible for the God over all; rather, even those things beyond reason yield to his decrees.

Fragment 6

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning the distinction between God and humans and the fact that the gap between God and humans is great, and concerning the act of sinning against God and the act of sinning against humans
From the eleventh book of the same work: [766]

> No one could be wiser than God nor could anyone know how, in an excellent and irreproachable manner, to create the path of appropriate conduct, as, of course, the Intellect beyond all things does.

Fragment 7

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning doubt in God and that one should not doubt God in anything; for all things are possible for him
From the eleventh book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

[22] The reference here to "question six" is puzzling. Neumann 1880a, 65–66 n. 1 conjectured that this refers to the sixth fragment from *c. Gal.* that Cyril quoted in book 11 of *c. Iul.*, in which case the following passage derives from Cyril's refutation of that sixth fragment. This is a plausible proposal, though we have yet to come across any other ancient source that enumerates the Julianic fragments cited by Cyril.

[23] Cyril also emphasizes Mary's difficulty understanding the mystery of Christ at *Jo.* 19:25 (3.89–91 Pusey).

Some people quietly tend to disbelieve events that are exceedingly lofty and exceptional, which at present exist only in hope and not yet in our
[767] sight, but which we expect to happen in the future.[24]

From Book 12

Fragment 8

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 179
Again, from Cyril's twelfth book found in the same third volume,[25] which begins:[26]

So then, using the various inventions of his chicanery, our enemy is attempting to lay siege to the truth and force it to surrender.

Fragment 9

Sacra: Letter mu, concerning repentance and confession
From the twelfth book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

He welcomes with great gladness the mourning of penitents as something advantageous for regaining their good merit and orderly conduct. And it is better that, before standing before the judgment seat of Christ, we should clear ourselves of every charge, pre-emptively gain the favor of our future
[768] accusers, and wash off in advance the filth of every fault, before we should fall into chastisement for these crimes and be dealt our punishments by the one who delivers just verdicts.

Fragment 10

Sacra: Letter kappa, concerning time, that it is necessary to redeem the time and that everything must be said and done at an appropriate time
From the twelfth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

[24] Cf. *c. Iul.* 10.40.16; fr. 19. Cf. Rom 8:24–25.

[25] This statement gives us an indication of the way *c. Iul.* appeared in manuscripts in antiquity. As argued by Chronz and Kinzig 2004, the treatise was originally grouped into pentads in multiple codices. That is, the first codex contained books 1–5, the second contained books 6–10, and so on. The present fragment thus comes from the twelfth book, which was included in the third codex (here called a βιβλίον). Similar references to the physical form of the book are found below in frs. 13.2–3; 15.2; 21.2; 24.2; 25.2; 26.2.

[26] This fragment is actually part of the heading for fr. 15 below. The compiler of the florilegium introduced the extract in fr. 15 by citing the incipit of book 12 of the treatise. The first four words of the book were also cited as an incipit in the heading to fr. 13.

> It seems to me that the best course of action, and a wise one, is not to miss the right time for doing something.

Fragment 11

Sacra: Letter iota, concerning equality, that it is necessary to give each their due
From the twelfth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> The judge of a contest does not simply bestow the prizes for excellence upon whichever of the contestants wants them; rather, he distributes the honors in proportion to the athletes' merits. [769]

Fragment 12

Sacra: Letter iota, concerning equality, that it is necessary to give each their due
From the same:

> To distribute equal rewards to unequal persons is an act of the greatest injustice.[27]

Fragment 13

Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople (ACO 2.2.1, pp.316.11–318.10)
Once more from the same codex there was read the passage from Saint Cyril's twelfth book found in the third volume of his doctrines *Against Julian*, which begins "Our enemy is attempting." It goes as follows:

> But given that, if [Christ] had not decided to do something he did not want to do, he would not even have suffered at all, he must be showing that, while the disgrace in the act of suffering was, as I said, something he did not want, he nevertheless chose it anyway on account of its benefit for everyone. And while his rejection of the cup implies it was something he did not want, nonetheless what he said to the Father implies he suffered willingly, namely, "Yet not my will, but yours be done."[28] For with God the Father approving and, as it were, jointly assenting to the Son's most wise [770]

[27] Aristotle similarly argued that justice requires that equal people should receive equal shares of something, and added that "distributing" (νέμωνται) unequal shares to equal persons or equal shares to unequal persons is the cause of quarrels (*EN* 5.3, 1131a20–24). Cf. Philo, *Decal.* 61.

[28] Luke 22:42. Presumably Cyril is here responding to some criticism of Julian concerning Jesus' prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, which had previously been attacked by Celsus (see Origen, *Cels.* 2.24–25). Cf. Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.2.1; 3.9.1.

plans,[29] he is said to have endured death in the flesh, in order that, by rising from the dead, he might "do away with death,"[30] destroy corruption, and justify the realm under heaven. This[31] is what he is teaching when he says, "I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of the one who sent me. And this is the will of the one who sent me, that I should lose none of those he has given me but raise them up on the last day."[32]

Observe, therefore, how for the purpose of raising up that which was given to him (namely us), he made that which he did not want, due to the dishonor in the act of suffering, to be something he freely chose. "For he endured the cross, despising its shame," as the divine Paul writes.[33] Furthermore, in the gospel narratives one can also see very clearly that the suffering was something he did not want – insofar as the weakness of his human thoughts was concerned – but, despite the enormous disgrace it involved, he chose it anyway since it pleased God, and indeed he seems to be willing to endure anything whatsoever for the sake of saving his many legitimate children.

This passage was likewise collated with the volume found here in the collection of the holy patriarchal library, with which it agreed.[34]

Fragment 14 [pp.770–71, 879–80]

Severus of Antioch, *Philalethes*[35]

Extract 179 of [our] opponent. From Cyril's twelfth book found in the
[880] third volume …[36] But since this abominable man[37] was intending to harm this correct sense, he took away certain words from the middle of the extract; the words at the beginning he included and the words that were taken away[38] from the middle of the extract and pillaged are

[29] Gk.: ταῖς σοφωτάταις οἰκονομίαις. [30] Cf. 1 Cor 15:26; 2 Tim 1:10; Heb 2:14.

[31] The acta from the council omit the following sentence and move on to the next paragraph with the connecting phrase καὶ μετὰ βραχέα ("and after a short bit"), but the GCS editors have restored it on the basis of the florilegium in ms Vatopediani 507.

[32] John 6:38–39. [33] Heb 12:2.

[34] This editorial comment shows the concern of the participants in the council to verify the accuracy of the texts employed as evidence. The above passage had been excerpted and included in a florilegium presented by the papal legates at the council, and it was checked for accuracy against the copy of *Against Julian* housed in the patriarchal library in Constantinople.

[35] Severus of Antioch's *Philalethes* is a miaphysite response to the Chalcedonian collection of extracts from Cyril's corpus known as the *Florilegium Cyrillianum*, which included five passages from *Against Julian.* The word translated here as "extract" is the Syriac transliteration of the Greek term κεφάλαιον which is used in the florilegium to refer to the numbered passages from Cyril's corpus it contains. Thus, by "extract" Severus is referring to the quotation from Cyril numbered 179 in the florilegium (= *c. Iul.* fr. 15).

[36] *c. Iul.* fr. 15 follows immediately here and is noted by the ellipses above.

[37] i.e., the compiler of the florilegium.

[38] The GCS edition here has an error, printing ܡܢܗܠܟ instead of ܡܢܗܠܟܝ which is the reading in the CSCO editions of Severus' *Philalethes* and *Apology*.

these: after citing "he permitted that human nature to experience participation even in pain and sorrow," he excised, "because he truly had become like us, in the flesh I mean."[39] And the fact that he accepted these things in order to provide an example for human nature explains what is written at the end of the extract: "and a useful fact[40] beckons us towards it." [These words] entirely explain [the extract] when they are included in the quotation, along with the excised words [that occur] prior to the extract. Here are the words prior to the extract, which [our] opponent excised:

> "Therefore, as the time drew near when the crowds of the Jews were going to rage against him, it was necessary that, by means of how he conducted himself, he should teach that it is fitting that we should act similarly when danger is imminent, temptation is pursuing [us], and the horrors of death are attacking. So then, if he, as God, wanted to put a complete stop to the harm the Jews [were doing to him], there was nothing that could have prevented him from appearing happy and completely disregarding these painful things and from being superior to pain and above all fear. Nevertheless, since the same one while being God, was also human, he does not despise human experiences that were endured for the sake of the economy."

Fragment 15[41]

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 179

Again, from Cyril's twelfth book, found in the same third volume, which begins "So then, using the various inventions of his chicanery, our enemy is attempting to lay siege to the truth and force it to surrender":

[39] Severus here refers to *c. Iul.* fr. 15, arguing that his opponent has shrewdly omitted a key line when excerpting the passage in order to make it support his dyophysite Christology. The florilegium survives in Greek without the words Severus highlights, as noted by the ellipses in fr. 15.

[40] A striking divergence is apparent in the Greek and the Syriac versions of this line. The Greek reads ἀναγκαίου πράγματος ("an inescapable/necessary/required fact/deed"; *c. Iul.* fr. 15.11), while the Syriac has ܡܬܥܒܕ ܡܬܚܫܚ ("a useful fact"; 880.7 Kaufhold). In both cases the referent of the "fact" in view remains ambiguous, but it is difficult to see how ܡܬܥܒܕ would be a reasonable translation of ἀναγκαῖος. The reading of the Syriac text is more suitable to Severus' interpretation of the line given the preceding sentence, which views the events of Christ's life as a model for humans, and so "useful" to them. Parallels from elsewhere in Cyril's corpus can be adduced to support both readings: at *Is.* 49:8–12 (PG 70.1057a) he says Jesus' prayer to the Father in the Garden of Gethsemane was "a pattern for us and a model of necessary action" (ὑποτύπωσις καὶ ὑπογραμμὸς ἀναγκαίου πράγματος); while twice in his *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* he claims the prophets act "for a useful and necessary deed" (χρησίμου τε καὶ ἀναγκαίου πράγματος ἕνεκα [*Os.* 1:3 (1.23.30 Pusey)]; ἐπί τινι χρησίμῳ καὶ ἀναγκαίῳ … πράγματι [*Nah.* praef. (2.1.3–4 Pusey)]). See also *c. Iul.* fr. 30 (885.1 Kaufhold) below, where Cyril refers to Christ setting an example for the Christian "in a useful and necessary manner" (ܒܐܝܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܥܒܕ).

[41] On this fragment, see Guida 1996, 247. It is also preserved in Syriac (Kaufold, GCS 21, 880–81).

> Nevertheless, since the same one, while being God, was also human, he does not despise human experiences that were endured for the sake of the economy,[42] but, as it were, permits the nature like ours even to experience participation in both pain and distress[43] < … >.[44] And in fact, through him, human nature, which was otherwise weak, was able for the first time to rise to a state of courage, as he did, and defy death, since the action that is required beckons us even to this.

Fragment 16 [pp.772–73, 881]

Severus of Antioch, *Letter to Caesaria*[45]

This is why Saint Cyril also clearly noted the following in the twelfth of the books he wrote against Julian, the wicked servant of the daemons, on behalf of the Christians' worship:

> And since [Julian] says the divine Luke included in his account the statement that an angel was present and strengthened Jesus and that his sweat dripped in clot-like drops, that is, like blood, we will have to teach him that we have found nothing like this included in Luke's narrative,[46] unless it is a matter of an additional reading in the margin which is incorrect.[47] So then, when it comes to those books we have among us,

[42] Gk.: οἰκονομίαν.

[43] As highlighted by Guida 1996, 247, the wording here reflects Matt 26:37, and it is likely that Cyril is responding to Julian's criticism of the episode in the Garden of Gethsemane on the night before Jesus' crucifixion. Some of Julian's actual words in this section are found in *c. Gal.* fr. 95 Mas., a passage preserved by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*c. Iul.* fr. 8 Guida) in which Julian mocks the idea that Jesus needed to be strengthened by an angel despite being God.

[44] Based on the comments from Severus of Antioch in *c. Iul.* fr. 14 above, it seems that a line of text here was omitted by the excerptor who cited this passage in his florilegium of extracts ("because he truly had become like us, in the flesh I mean").

[45] The Syriac text of this letter was previously published with an accompanying English translation in Brooks 1920, 245–46.

[46] Cf. Luke 22:43–44. The evidence for these verses belonging to Luke's gospel is mixed, with some ancient witnesses including the passage and others omitting it; textual critics continue to debate the issue today. Cf. Blummel 2014, who discusses the present letter of Severus on pp.16–17 n. 80. Despite holding Cyril in high regard as a theological authority, in this letter Severus observes that the verses in question were found in the version of Luke used in Antioch, and that he himself had preached on them. The verses are conspicuously absent from Cyril's own homily on this section of Luke's gospel (*Hom. Lc.* 146). See also *c. Iul.* fr. 23, where Cyril discusses another textual variant in Luke's passion account.

[47] Cyril here uses similar language to that found in *c. Iul.* 9.11.24, where he also discussed a textual variant in a biblical passage. The Syriac here reads ܕܒܪ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܒܪ (literally "something from outside"), which is likely a translation of ἔξωθεν, the same word he used earlier to refer to the margin of a page where a textual variant was written. Moreover, the Syriac phrase ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ (literally "the addition of a written [word?]") is likely a translation of the verb προσγράφω used at 9.11.24. If the meaning of the phrase here is the same as in book 9, it would suggest that Cyril is describing a copy of the Gospel of Luke that includes notation of variant readings in the margin. Alternatively, the line here might simply be referring to a reading in the main text of Luke that Cyril takes to be a scribal interpolation.

there is nothing at all like this in them. It would, therefore, in my view,[48] be frantic folly for us to respond to him on this point and it would be superfluous for us to oppose him when these words haven't even been spoken, and [if we were to do so] we would be liable to ridicule, and quite rightly so.[49]

Fragment 17

Sacra: Letter beta, concerning life and this world, that both we and our life exist in distraction and hardship, and that the love of the world divides and alienates us from God
From the twelfth book of Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> I think it is quite clear to everyone that no one would choose to slander someone publicly. Yet this very thing is popular and occurs in the public square.

Fragment 18

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning prayer and those things that are accomplished by us through prayer
From the twelfth book of Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> It is necessary to pray always, both before contests and during the contests themselves and to seek aid from above.

Fragment 19

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning doubt in God and that one should not doubt God in anything; for all things are possible for him
From the twelfth book of the same work: [774]

> Exceptional marvels tend to elicit disbelief when recounted but are credited with belief when presented before our eyes, though sometimes even then with difficulty and hesitation.[50] Something like this is what Thomas experienced.[51]

[48] The GCS edition has an error here, presenting the word ܚܣܚܕ in place of the correct reading ܚܣܚܐ that is found in the critical edition of Severus' text in Patrologia Orientalis 14.246.3.
[49] On this fragment, cf. Trovato 2012, 270. [50] Cf. *c. Iul.* 10.40.16; fr. 7. [51] Cf. John 20:24–29.

Fragment 20

Florilegium Laurentianum: L[c] cap. A 7, 58
From the twelfth book of Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> The blessedness of the saints truly consists in a hope for things that surpass intellect and reason. "And," he says, "eye has not seen and ear has not heard and it has not entered into the heart of a human being what God
[775] has prepared for those who love him."[52]

From Book 13

Fragment 21

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 180
From the thirteenth book by the same author found in the same volume, which begins:

> This accuser of the saints shows an insatiable appetite for criticizing.[53]

Fragment 22

Catena Graecorum partum in evangelium secundum Marcum collectore atque interprete Petro Possino, p.343

> "And they were giving him wine mixed with myrrh to drink."[54] Myrrh is extremely bitter to the taste. Therefore, the other evangelist said "wine with gall,"[55] [while] this one said "wine mixed with myrrh."[56]

Thus says Cyril in the thirteenth book of *Against Julian*.

Fragment 23

Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, IV, 412–24

And it was reasonable that not only should the believers escape, but also those who in their ignorance and deception cooperated in the Lord's crucifixion, those
[776] about whom he said, "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are

[52] 1 Cor 2:9. [53] This fragment is part of the heading for fr. 24 below. [54] Mark 15:23.
[55] Matt 27:34.
[56] In light of the harmonizing intent of Cyril's explanation, Julian had probably pointed out the contradiction between the different passion accounts in the gospels regarding the nature and timing of the drink offered to Jesus on the cross. Macarius' anonymous Hellene also highlighted this point (*Apocr*. 2.23.2–5).

doing"[57] (despite the fact that Cyril, in the thirteenth book [of] *Against Julian*, says this prayer of the Lord is not present in the gospels,[58] it is in fact mentioned among us); and not only these people but also those who were not present at that time or who were not living in Jerusalem, who, for this reason, did not participate in the accursed high priests' unholy plan to crucify him; or those also who, though present, did not acquire this defilement (even if he himself blessed the whole earth under heaven, it turned out contrary to the plan of that God-hating council of lawless men) – it was fitting that all these should later be sealed by faith in Christ.

Fragment 24[59]

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 180

From the thirteenth book by the same author found in the same volume, which begins "This accuser of the saints shows an insatiable appetite for criticizing":

> "Today," he says, "you will be with me in paradise."[60] But the enemy of the truth does not believe these words. For "how," he says, "is it possible for him on the same day both to be in paradise and 'in the heart of the earth'?"[61] Now how could someone not see that in thinking and saying such things he has missed the point[62] and, to be blunt, cannot form in his imagination even a vague notion of the mystery of the only-begotten's incarnation? For even though his all-holy body lay in the tomb dead and [777] lifeless, he, being God by nature, was still omnipresent, since all things are filled by him and he is not absent from anything at all. So also the blessed David has sung in the psalms: "Where shall I go from your Spirit, and where shall I flee from your presence? If I descend into Hades, you are present."[63]

[57] Luke 23:34.

[58] The early manuscript evidence for Luke 23:34 is indeed varied. Many early manuscripts omit it, including P75, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae (originally absent, though it was later added), and Codex Washingtonianus. On the question of its originality and its patristic reception, see Eubank 2010.

[59] This fragment is also preserved in Syriac (Kaufhold, GCS 21, 881–82).

[60] Luke 23:43.

[61] For "in the heart of the earth," cf. Matt 12:40. As first noted in Guida 1996, 247–52, this sentence refers to a portion of *Against the Galileans* that is otherwise lost and could be a verbatim quotation of Julian. It was not included in Masaracchia's 1990 edition of Julian's *c. Gal.* As pointed out by Guida, Origen addresses this same apparent contradiction at *Jo.* 32.395–97, acknowledging that some had been so troubled by it that they conjectured Luke 23:43 was a textual corruption. The issue was also commented upon by Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridua inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Jesu Christi spatio* (GNO 9.1, pp.290–94); Augustine, *Ep.* 187.3–21; Isho'dad of Merv, *Commentary on Luke* (Gibson, III: 95; trans. I: 206).

[62] Gk.: σκόπου. Cf. *c. Iul.* 2.35 with note.

[63] Ps 138(139):7–8.

From Book 14

Fragment 25

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 178
From the fourteenth book by the same author found in the third volume of *Against Julian*, which begins:

> The divine prophet Jeremiah, or rather God through him, to the enemies of the truth as if somehow …[64]

Fragment 26[65]

Florilegium Cyrillianum no. 178
From the fourteenth book by the same author found in the third volume of *Against Julian*, which begins, "The divine prophet Jeremiah, or rather
[778] God through him, to the enemies of the truth as if somehow … ":

> How did we come to believe that the Word, being God, truly became incarnate, if it is the case that he recoils from humanity's insignificance?[66] Accordingly, he has no need of either growth or wisdom, since, as God, he is completely perfect;[67] but with a supreme accommodation,[68] he wisely allowed the nature of his body to follow its own laws and used to permit his body parts to mature little by little. Moreover, he used to display exactly as much wisdom too as was likely to be appropriate to his body's maturity, so that no one would believe there to be anything strange and unusual on account of him exceeding and going beyond what was required.

Fragment 27 [pp.778, 883]

From the fourteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> For the holy body was put in the tomb, dead and without a soul.

Fragment 28 [pp.779–80, 883–84]

Concerning the fact that the evangelists have written to us about four Marys and do not contradict one another even though one says it was in the evening that the women came to the tomb while another [says it was]

[64] This fragment is part of the heading for fr. 26 below.
[65] On this fragment, see Guida 1996, 246. It is also preserved in Syriac (Kaufhold, GCS 21, 882).
[66] We depart from the GCS text in punctuating this sentence as a question.
[67] The mention of "growth" (αὔξης) and "wisdom" (σοφίας) is perhaps an allusion to Luke 2:52, which describes the adolescent Jesus "advancing in wisdom and stature" (προέκοπτεν σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ).
[68] Gk.: οἰκονομικώτατα.

in the morning. From the fourteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian the Pagan*:

> [Julian] writes about the holy evangelists, that they contradict one another in what they say. For, in Matthew, Mary Magdalene and another Mary went to the tomb "in the evening on the Sabbath when the first day of the week was dawning," while according to Mark they [went] after dawn once "the sun had risen."[69] And these women, according to Matthew, saw an angel, but, according to Mark, it was a young man.[70] And, according to Matthew, they went and told[71] the disciples about Christ's resurrection but, according to Mark, they kept quiet, not saying a word to anyone.[72] With these words he brings an accusation against the writings of the saints and claims they contradict one another.[73]
>
> Now those who are concerned about the truth must first of all recognize that the evangelists write to us about four Marys: one is the mother of our Lord, another is [Mary] Magdalene, the third is Cleophas' [Mary],[74] and the fourth along with them is the [Mary] of James and Joses.[75] Matthew, therefore, said that it was Mary Magdalene and another Mary who came to the tomb in the evening, while Mark mentioned [Mary] Magdalene and the Mary of Joses – for she is James' [Mary] – and said they came and saw where he was laid.[76] And further on [Mark] said, "After the Sabbath had passed, Mary of James and Salome bought spices and came in the morning to the tomb."[77] So then, the arrival at the tomb of Mary

[69] Cf. Matt 28:1; Mark 16:2. [70] Cf. Matt 28:2; Mark 16:5.

[71] We are here emending the Syriac text in the GCS edition (which corresponds to Nestle's version of this fragment; Neumann 1880a, 54.13). The form printed is ܗܘܩܛܢ which is clearly a Peal participle. However, in the Peal this root means "to think." The Pael of the root means "to tell/announce," which works well in this context, but that would require a ܡ in front of the participle. We hypothesize that the Pael form ܡܗܩܛܢ is the correct reading and that the initial ܡ was misread as a prefixed ܗ.

[72] Cf. Matt 28:8; Mark 16:8.

[73] This paragraph is *c. Gal.* fr. 96 Mas. Two of the three contradictions Julian mentions were dealt with in Eusebius, *Qu. Marin.* 1; 4. The seventh-century bishop John of Thessalonica seemingly also alluded to this criticism of Julian, though without naming him. See Trovato 2012, 270; Cook 2016, 196–97. In addition, Theodore bar Koni and Isho'dad of Merv mentioned Julian's criticism of the timing of the resurrection (= Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* test. 7 Guida). Because Isho'dad attributes the objection to both Porphyry and Julian, Becker included it in his edition of Porphyry's *Contra Christianos* as fr. 62T. Cook 2016, 198 has argued that Julian took this criticism not from Eusebius but from Porphyry's earlier attack on the gospels, but, given the clear overlap between Eusebius' *Gospel Problems and Solutions* and *c. Gal.* fr. 111 Cra. (= *c. Iul.* fr. 75), it is more probable that Eusebius was his source here too.

[74] Cf. John 19:25.

[75] The four Marys mentioned by Cyril are also highlighted in Eusebius *Qu. Marin.* 2.6–7, who similarly proposed multiple visits of various groups of women to the tomb, though he was primarily concerned with discrepancies between Matthew and John, while Cyril, following Julian's lead, is focused on Matthew and Mark. Cf. Cyril, *Jo.* 20:1–9 (3.109–10 Pusey), where Cyril addresses a similar problem concerning the timing of the resurrection in Matthew and John.

[76] Cf. Matt 28:1; Mark 15:47. [77] Cf. Mark 16:1.

> Magdalene and James' [Mary] happened first at one point in time, and then, at some point after this, there was a subsequent arrival of James' Mary and Salome. And it is clear from the timing and from the differences [in the two accounts] that they came, as it were, twice[78] … for to them … Matthew says an angel appeared to [the women] and told them that Christ had risen and that they should run to share the good news with the disciples and tell them that Christ had risen.[79] And further on [Matthew says] Jesus himself appeared to [the women] and told them to tell his brothers that they should go ahead of him to Galilee, and that they did go and told the disciples that they should go to Galilee.[80] But Mark, as I said, says that in the morning as soon as the sun had risen the women came with spices and saw a young man and that they heard that Christ had risen and that they should go and tell his brothers that he was going before them to Galilee. But [Mark] did not say that Christ appeared to them nor that they said anything to the disciples. For "they said nothing to anyone."[81]

From Book 15

Fragment 29a

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning people who are double-minded and fickle and have a restless mindset

From the fifteenth book of the blessed Cyril of Alexandria's *Against*
[781] *Julian*:

> Casting aspersions upon others is quite often as easy as riding a horse on the open plain and many people are unable to control their speech. But it is necessary, in my view, that the accusations someone makes about anything whatsoever should be followed by evidence. And if the person intent on condemning someone fails to do so, he will only win for himself a reputation for libel.

Fragment 29b [pp.781, 884]

All these things are confirmed by Saint Cyril as well, who writes the following in the fifteenth book of *Against Julian the Pagan*:

> For it is necessary, in my view, that accusations someone makes about some given matter should be backed by evidence. And if someone is not up to the task when he seeks to accuse someone, he wins a reputation as a

[78] At this point there is a minor loss of text due to the edge of the manuscript page being torn.
[79] Cf. Matt 28:5–7. [80] Cf. Matt 28:9–10. [81] Mark 16:8.

libelous person, and especially in court.[82] For it is always a simple matter to find something or other to denounce about a person, and when people can't stand something they won't stop talking about it.[83] But only those who know the truth are able to adduce evidence to support what they say.

Fragment 30 [pp.781–82, 884–85]

That our Lord ate and drank. From the fifteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian* when Julian mocks the fact that our Lord ate and drank:[84]

> For the Savior ate and drank but he [was] not a glutton and drunkard as the Jews dared to say.[85] For the divinely inspired John, when he was speaking in the wilderness, ate locusts and wild honey.[86] But Christ, in a [885]
> useful and necessary manner, did not eschew any cooked food at all. For the divinely inspired John needed the toils of self-denial so that he might cut off the mind of the flesh and put to death its innate desire for pleasure. And the fact that he kept himself from food, which was [otherwise] beneficial for him and for what he needed for his well-being,[87] was best and useful. But which of these toils did the Savior and Lord of all need, given that he was holy by nature, sanctifies everything, and knows no sin? But if he too had kept himself from food, there would have been a significant risk that people might assume he did not condescend to touch the sort of things that are unclean and profane, or hence that he too, like us, needed the toils of self-denial to be able, that is, to restrain the pleasures of his flesh, as is required. But this could not have been.

Fragment 31

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning almsgiving and doing good deeds for the poor

From the fifteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> The practice of almsgiving scrubs away sin, "triumphs over condemnation,"[88] quenches the flame of punishment, wins the judge's sympathies,[89]

[82] The mention here of the courtroom is in keeping with Julian's own framing of his argument against Christianity in terms of a courtroom dispute (cf. *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Mas. [= *c. Iul.* 2.7]).

[83] These two clauses literally read "For the fact that someone accuses in some way is always easy and the fact that they do not endure is in many words." The meaning is obscure and the translation above is an attempt to clarify it based upon the contrast with the next sentence.

[84] This incipit is *c. Gal.* fr. 97 Mas. [85] Cf. Matt 11:19; Luke 7:34. [86] Cf. Mark 1:6; Matt 3:4.

[87] The syntax of the immediately preceding Syriac clause is convoluted and its meaning obscure.

[88] Cf. Jas 2:13.

[89] Cf. Luke 18:2–8 (especially v. 5, ὑπωπιάζῃ, which according to Zigabenus' *Comm.Luc.* 1052.14 was synonymous with δυσώπει, the verb used by Cyril here).

and, furthermore, joins us to God and causes us to be numbered among the choirs of the saints.[90] Moreover, it also carries us off to the city above,
[783] and procures for us a heavenly kingdom, an unfading glory, and a firm and steadfast hope. Indeed, is there anything that contributes to our unflappable contentment that isn't procured by almsgiving?

Fragment 32

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning almsgiving and doing good deeds for the poor
From the same:

> The one who distributes his own wealth to those in poverty and need is never himself poor. For he has instead piled up wealth "in heaven."[91] "For," it says, "the one who has mercy on the poor is lending to God."[92] Trustworthy is he to whom you have lent your money; faithful is he who receives it. He knows how to pay back what was given with interest added to it. He who receives the deposit of the compassionate person is rich and generous.

Fragment 33

Sacra: Letter iota, concerning clothing, that one must not use fine clothing and a man must not wear feminine attire
[784] From the fifteenth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> Being well-dressed is but an adolescent concern that is pleasing merely in outward appearance and entertains the eyes.[93]

Fragment 34

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning self-determination[94] and that self-determination has been given to us
From the fifteenth book:

> The human intellect is managed by its own intentions and pursues each and every action voluntarily, since this too seemed correct to God, the master Craftsman of everything. Consequently, even if one of us comes to participate in the indwelling Holy Spirit[95] thanks to holy baptism, he is not for this reason released from living according to his own judgment and in whatever way seems right to him; rather, with a free rein, so to speak, he assents either to the good or to its opposite.

[90] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 60 below. [91] Cf. Luke 18:22. [92] Prov 19:17. [93] Cf. Matt 6:28.
[94] Gk.: αὐτεξουσίου.
[95] The GCS edition here reads πεύματος, no doubt a mistake for πνεύματος.

Fragment 35

Sacra: Letter pi, concerning buying and selling
From the fifteenth book of the blessed Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> In shops they occasionally mix a few valuable things together with lots of worthless junk, using the few valuable items to induce people to come in and persuading them to take the worthless junk as well as what is good. [785]

Fragment 36

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning sins, that our sins procure bad things for us and bring them upon us
From the fifteenth book of Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> "We all stumble in many ways."[96] For our nature is sick with a predisposition to sin thanks to those who in the beginning gave an entrance to passion.

Fragment 37

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning just people, that they are despised and ridiculed by the unjust and irreverent
From the fifteenth book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> It is impossible to avoid the fact that good people will appear utterly and in every way abominable and reprehensible in the eyes of those who highly esteem the wasted life of lawless individuals. [786]

From Book 16

Fragment 38

Sacra: Letter upsilon, concerning a violent person
From the sixteenth book of the same work:

> To act violently towards someone is utterly shameful and disgraceful and is inappropriate for those determined to live well; you would not find this kind of person among those aiming to be respectable and good.

[96] Jas 3:2.

Fragment 39 [pp.786–91, 885–88]

From the sixteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian the Pagan*, when he accused Christ on the grounds that, despite saying "he came to fulfill the law" and "everyone who repudiates the smallest commandment and teaches people to do so will be called least,"[97] he in fact repudiated the Sabbath and said that "the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath"[98] and that it is not something that goes into the mouth that defiles it,[99] when the law does declare food to be defiled.[100]

Saint Cyril says the following in opposition to these statements:

> Now the fact that he came in order to fulfill the law is something that I too affirm, along with everyone who possesses accurate and clear knowledge of the sacred scriptures. But if he appears as someone who transformed the shadow of the law into the truth and [if] he changed the [decrees] laid down in ancient types into something clearer, he does so not in opposition to the law, as [our] opponent thinks and says. Rather, on the contrary, he takes that which is, as I said, giving birth to the image of the truth and conveys it to the truth. Therefore, just as those experts in the fine arts, who apply to an outline on a canvas a diverse array of colors and do not thereby damage the outline but bring about a beautiful appearance, so also the Lord of all and Savior who is the epitome of Wisdom [did the same]. And although in the beginning he spoke the law and for those living at that time prefigured the mystery as if in a shadow, at the time of
> [886] the end of the age he has, through the very things that have happened, demonstrated what was announced beforehand to those earlier people through a myriad of forms and types and riddles.
>
> But I will, if it pleases [you], demonstrate that he issued the commandments that came from him also with a view towards the precise illumination of contemplative realities. So, the law that came through Moses commands that we rest on the Sabbath and that we use the food that was prepared beforehand for it. This is why, as we understand it, the day before it was named "preparation."[101] Nevertheless, on the Sabbath they did in fact offer the priestly duties that had been laid down for the priesthood. For they offered to the God over all what was laid down in the law, and they incurred no blame by carrying out this activity. For their desire to do these things was not condemned by the stipulations in the law despite the fact that they were also commanded to have no burden upon their shoulders and not to go outdoors and not to depart from their tents

[97] Matt 5:17, 19. [98] Cf. Matt 12:8. [99] Cf. Matt 15:11.
[100] The preceding paragraph is *c. Gal.* fr. 98 Mas.
[101] i.e., the day before the Sabbath was known among the Jews as "Preparation Day." Cf. Mark 15:42; John 19:31.

when keeping the Sabbath. For it says, "sit, everyone, in your tents," and "none of you shall bring forth a bundle from your house on the Sabbath day."[102] And it allowed circumcision as well on the Sabbath, without penalty.

So then what will [our] opponent say in response to these things? What is going on here, my friend? When the law commands that they must keep themselves from all toil and labor, why would the priests be permitted to proceed according to their normal custom and why did they carry out circumcision too? Or what was so significant about[103] the person keeping the Sabbath bringing forth a bundle and going outside of their tent? And why did they prepare food in advance as someone would do if they were convinced they should not do so on the Sabbath?

Is it not then clear to everyone that, unless there is some image of the truth in these [decrees], the law would have no use whatsoever? For we keep the Sabbath in Christ not by abstaining from ordinary deeds and [deeds] that no one would deserve to be censured for, even if we happen to do them, but [by abstaining] from our inclination towards doing evil. For this is a beautiful and admirable rest. But we do not keep ourselves from diligence in holy pursuits which are actually a fragrance that, in an intelligible sense, is pleasing to God. And the fact that every one of us partakes of goods he has labored over in advance is most beautifully illustrated by the requirement that we prepare food in advance, before the Sabbath. For the type further illustrates that, when we observe the Sabbath in an intelligible sense, we receive the circumcision that is in the Spirit and is not made by hands. And we are delivered from every burden when we cast off the weighty impurity of sin.

For we have been justified in Christ and we do not depart from the holy tent but take special delight in abiding in the church's teaching. For this is truly the holy and divine tent and, in our love for it, we make a petition to God as well as songs of praise when we say, "Lovely are your tents, O Lord [887]
of hosts; my soul is longing and lying in wait in the courts of the Lord."[104] So then, with respect to the shadow's impotence, the law that came through Moses is not useful. But if it is transformed into the truth and understood in spiritual terms, then it proclaims the mystery of Christ and introduces us to the knowledge of essential things.

Moreover, [it is by virtue of] the fact that he does things in the body, that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath. For he, namely Christ, refuted the Jews by pointing out that both he and the Father do not abstain from labor even on the Sabbath: "For my Father works until now and I myself work too."[105] And we know that the Sabbath rest was

[102] Exod 16:29; Jer 17:22. [103] Literally, "what was it to the person keeping the Sabbath that … ."
[104] Ps 83(84):2–3. [105] John 5:17.

> manifestly corporeal in nature. We find that the saints did not care very much [about it].[106] For example, Joshua, who was completely devoted to God, captured Jericho [on the Sabbath] once he had become commander after Moses. But if the Son of Man is not also Lord of the Sabbath as the Savior says, why was Joshua, who conquered on the Sabbath, not cursed? For it is written, "Cursed is everyone who does not pay attention to the things written in this book of the law to do them."[107] He nevertheless armed himself against Jericho, not contrary to God's will but rather by becoming a man of arms for him. And they were not prevented from conquering out of respect for the Sabbath but were instead encouraged to ready [their] weapons and cry out against their enemies and do everything according to the custom of war. And the fact that they did not incur any punishment for their actions is shown by what happened next.[108] So I maintain that even in the eyes of the very one who issued the law about the Sabbath rest, this was not something he wanted.[109]

And after other things:

> For the law provides us with the conception of things that are very useful but does so by means of a riddle. For those [creatures] that are impure – certain < … > animals[110] and certain birds and certain [animals] in the sea – are sometimes taken as an image and a type of people who are unclean and defiled, the sort of people whose company is best avoided by those who desire to live correctly and lawfully.[111] For "bad company corrupts good morals."[112] And Paul has also written, "If someone who is called a brother should be sexually immoral or a drunk or a slanderer, we should not even eat with such a person."[113] Therefore, it is necessary for us to keep ourselves from those who are defiled and to run away from bad people. For it is written, "He who walks with a wise person will be wise but he who walks with a fool will be recognized [as one]."[114]

[106] On the Old Testament saints not being overly meticulous in keeping the Mosaic law, see also *c. Iul.* 9.46.11–17.

[107] Deut 27:26; Gal 3:10.

[108] Cyril similarly uses the example of the conquest of Jericho to argue that Sabbath observance was not necessary at *Jo.* 5:16–17 (1.313–14 Pusey).

[109] Similar statements about the law and its ordinances not being "wanted" by God can be found at *c. Iul.* 4.16.9; 9.23.11; 9.26.21.

[110] The GCS edition here has the word ܒܥܫܐ ("deaf"), but we suspect it is a textual corruption of some kind and have marked it as a lacuna, since in parallel passages Cyril speaks of three classes of animals – land animals, birds, and sea creatures (cf. *c. Iul.* 2.27.20; 3.6.2; 3.39.22; 7.34.24–25) – typically using the word χερσαῖος for the first group. Nowhere else in *c. Iul.* does he discuss deaf animals.

[111] Cyril provides a more extended exposition of this idea at *c. Iul.* 9.36–37.

[112] 1 Cor 15:33, a maxim that goes back to Euripides, *fr.* 1024. [113] 1 Cor 5:11. [114] Prov 13:20.

And again:

> "With a holy person you will be holy, and with an innocent person you will be innocent, and with a chosen person you will be chosen, and with a crooked person you will be crooked."[115] Therefore, when Christ says, "it is not what enters the mouth that defiles a person,"[116] he is not repudiating the law. For he knows that it is a shadow and a type. On the contrary, it is most beautifully fulfilled when people choose to keep themselves from those who are impure. For "food does not raise us up towards God. For if we eat, we gain nothing, and if we do not eat, we lack nothing," as it is [888]
> written.[117] For it is what comes forth through the mouth and the tongue that truly causes impurity: insults, slanders and calumny, blasphemy and seething which [come] from the heart as if from evil intentions. These are what make a person impure according to our Savior's saying: "For all food is good and there is nothing that is to be rejected as impure by nature. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."[118]

Fragment 40a

Sacra: Letter pi, concerning children honoring their parents and the good things that come to those who obey them
From Saint Cyril's sixteenth volume:

> Children must yield to their parents, but wherever the "word of truth"[119] prevails, let God be honored and let his affairs triumph, even over the power of natural affection.[120]

Fragment 40b [pp.792–93, 888–89]

By the same author, from the sixteenth book of *Against Julian*:

> For [children] must submit to the parents from whom they came. But wherever the word of truth prevails, let God be honored and let his concerns triumph, even over the natural power of affection. And even the obligation that sons owe to fathers and fathers to sons ought to be despised. And one must separate oneself from those who are most beloved of all. For he also teaches us this in another place when he says, "He who loves father or mother more than me is not someone worthy of me. And

[115] Ps 17(18):26–27. [116] Matt 15:11. [117] 1 Cor 8:8. [118] 1 Tim 4:4.
[119] A possible allusion to 2 Cor 6:7 or 2 Tim 2:15.
[120] In addition to *c. Iul.* frs. 40a and 40b, Cyril also discusses honoring God above parents at *c. Iul.* 10.14.11–16.

he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me."[121] For it is necessary that we should instead first ascribe to God what is required, which triumphs even over the love owed to those who share blood and kinship, since he too is the Father and head and begetter of each person insofar as he is understood as Creator and gives us our existence. And he also has added to these things a stability in our state of well-being. Thus, the love of God indeed causes a division among these which are the greatest of all family relations.

Now if [there are] some who are intent upon setting their minds on his concerns, [there are] others who separate themselves from what is beneficial and descend into the pit of destruction. For it is inappropriate that the wise should follow the foolish; rather those who love disgraceful conduct [should follow] those who habitually contemplate the virtues. Now if, on the one hand, Christ commands that those intent on setting their minds on his concerns must guard [their] soul in unison, and afterwards some are not vigilant in every aspect of this [endeavor] and should fall due to their feeble human soul,[122] why would this harm the divine laws or why would it injure the glory of the lawgiver? For he has given a law that would be useful if they were to carry it out.[123] And as for those who neglected[124] [the laws] when it was incumbent upon them to keep them, they are subject to rebuke and disgrace. And even if they should cling to the feebleness of [their] human soul, they will find not a single word of forgiveness at all. But if, on the other hand, people flee from the truth and
[889] sever the bonds of peace,[125] and have sunk down and gone to the point of having nothing good, we should not blame the lawgiver but instead those people themselves, assuming, that is, one intends to be a wise person and an excellent judge.

Moreover, the divinely inspired Paul points out quite well that those who are peacemakers like Christ, all of whom have his hand upon them, are ministers of priestly messages. For he says, "Therefore, we have been made ambassadors for Christ as if God were appealing [to you] through us. On behalf of Christ, we beseech you to be reconciled to God."[126] And we are reconciled to God when we adhere to his divine laws, and we are

[121] Matt 10:37.

[122] We here are emending the GCS text which on line 24 prints ܪܥܝܐ ("rubbing clean, purifying"). As a masculine noun, this would not agree with the feminine adjective that immediately follows. The correct reading is no doubt ܪܥܝܢ as it appears in the same phrase in line 28 below. Nestle's edition agrees with the GCS text (Neumann 1880a, 60.26).

[123] On the usefulness of laws, see also *c. Iul.* 3.11–17.

[124] We are here emending the GCS text, since the word ܐܫܬܡܥ on line 26 does not seem to make sense as it stands. However, if the nun is changed to a yod (i.e., ܐܫܬܡܥ), it can be read as an Aphel perfect third masculine plural of ܫܡܥ ("to disregard, neglect"), which makes sense in the context.

[125] Cf. Eph 4:3. [126] 2 Cor 5:20.

united through holiness when, as I just said, we cast off the sin that causes disgrace. And those who join to him people who are far off, who do not know him, and who do not want to consider and do what pleases him, they will be called sons of God, and quite rightly so.[127]

Fragment 41 [pp.794, 889]

That Christ preached also to the spirits in Sheol. From the sixteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> When the only-begotten Word of God became human and appeared in our likeness upon earth, he bestowed forgiveness of sins not only upon those who were alive at that time, but, drawing upon [his] immeasurable love for humanity, he gave an equivalent grace to the spirits in Sheol as well. For he preached to them too and removed the gates of Sheol for those who were in darkness. For Christ was Lord both for the dead as well as for the living,[128] and he rescued both the former and the latter through faith. Tell me then, how can you dare accuse [him] of disregarding those earlier people and allotting the calling and salvation through Christ to those who just lived in the last days,[129] when, as I said, he foreordained grace both for the dead as well as for the living? For "he preached also to the spirits in prison who formerly disobeyed," as it is written.[130]

Fragment 42 [pp.795, 889–90]

Once more from the sixteenth book by the same author:

> And it is said that Pythagoras descended into the cave that is called Idaeus, stayed at the tomb of Zeus, and offered the required sacrifices according to the custom of the pagans. And when he departed, he wrote upon the [890]
> place, "Here lies Zan whom they call Zeus."[131] And again, when it comes to the son of Semele himself, they say he too is buried next to the Apollo who is called "golden."[132]

[127] Cf. Matt 5:9 [128] Cf. Rom 14:9.

[129] This sentence is *c. Gal.* fr. 108 Cra. See the similar idea presented by Julian in *c. Gal.* fr. 20 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 3.46). Julian's criticism is similar to one voiced by Porphyry in *Chr.* fr. 76; 79 Becker.

[130] 1 Pet 3:19–20.

[131] Cyril's source for this report about Pythagoras is Porphyry, *VP* 43.16–22, which he cited in *c. Iul.* 10.20.28–33. Zeus's burial is also mentioned in *c. Iul.* fr. 64b. Cf. Hintze and Morenz 1954, for a (legendary) report of Cyril debating with pagans about the death of Zeus.

[132] The son of Semele was Dionysus, and his burial next to the golden Apollo is also mentioned by Cyril at *c. Iul.* 1.12.17–19; 10.20.7–13; fr. 64b. His source was likely Eusebius, *Chron*. II, p.54b.15–26 Helm; p.168 Karst.

Fragment 43 [pp.795, 890]

From the sixteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> Thus, [Jesus] takes as an example the eye of a needle and a camel,[133] not [meaning] the animal, as the wicked, utterly foolish, and idiotic Julian imagined, but instead the thick rope that is in every ship.[134] For so it is called according to the custom of those who are learned in the affairs of sailors.[135]

Fragment 44

Sacra: Letter gamma, concerning agriculture, that it is good to work the land

[796] From the sixteenth book of Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> It is reasonable that those who are skilled at tilling the ground ought to be commended.

Fragment 45

Victor Antiochenus, *Catena Graecorum patrum in evangelium secundum Marcum*

Julian, in the sixteenth book of *Against Julian*, while commenting on the word *quadrans*, said it is equal to a quarter of an *obol*. And here it calls two *lepta* a *quadrans*.[136] Therefore, an *obol* is equal to eight *lepta*.[137]

Fragment 46

Sacra: Letter upsilon, concerning hypocrisy and dissimulation and feigned piety and those who are sick with these things
From the sixteenth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

[133] Cf. Matt 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25. This dominical saying was also a matter of debate in Origen, *Cels*. 6.16; Macarius Magnes, *Apocr*. 3.5.

[134] This sentence is *c. Gal.* fr. 109 Cra.

[135] Cyril gives the same interpretation of this dominical saying at *in Mt.* fr. 219 Reuss; *Hom. Lc.* 123 (338.15–17 Payne Smith); *Hom. Lc*. 18:20f (PG 72.857c). His point here seems to be related to the similarity between the words κάμιλος ("rope") and κάμηλος ("camel") although the evidence for the former word is slim and, as noted in LSJ, it may have arisen simply as an emendation inspired by the exegetical tradition Cyril passes on. The interpretation is found also in a catena fragment attributed to Origen on this gospel passage (*in Mt*. fr. 390) and also found its way into later Armenian and Georgian translations of the relevant New Testament passages which refer to a rope rather than a camel.

[136] Cf. Mark 12:42.

[137] This *testimonium* was not included in Masaracchia's edition of *c. Gal.*

> The person who "pleases humans"[138] would naturally receive praise from them as his reward.[139] Yet he will receive absolutely none of those rewards that come from God. For the merit of his courage – I mean earthly courage – didn't make God take notice but merely the eyes of his [human] onlookers instead. [797]

Fragment 47

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning God's coming vengeance for those who have been wronged and that it is necessary to entrust plans for vengeance to God

From the sixteenth book of Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> Everyone who has been wronged is consumed by pain. But sometimes, when one is unable to defend himself or to respond in kind on account of being inferior in strength to the person who wronged him, he will call to his aid the sting of the divine[140] hatred of wickedness.[141]

Fragment 48

Sacra: Letter upsilon, concerning arrogant and pompous people and those who are braggarts and vainglorious

From the same:[142]

> Worthy of the highest honor is the person who hates the braggart or rather the act of bragging itself, which is the most shameful of all vices in the eyes of both God and humans, being loathsome and despicable. Who doesn't regard the disdainful person as onerous? Who doesn't deplore [798] someone with a bloated ego? Who doesn't rebuke people puffed up with grand ideas of themselves and say that this ailment[143] is the most shameful of diseases? For the braggart is nearly always rash, stubborn, and untameable, both quick to anger and implacable, and arguably harsher than rocks,[144] more piercing than thorns, and more burdensome than any stone.

[138] Cf. Gal 1:10; 1 Thess 2:4. [139] A possible allusion to Matt 6:1–2, 5.

[140] Literally, "the hatred of wickedness coming down from above" (τῆς ἄνωθεν μισοπονηρίας).

[141] This passage was cited by Constantinus Harmenopulus, in his *Manuale legume sive Hexabiblos* 1.1.7.

[142] According to the GCS apparatus, this fragment and the next one appear in the mss after a fragment that is attributed to *c. Iul.* book 16, which in fact comes from Cyril's treatise *De adoratione*. Even though the earlier fragment is incorrectly attributed to *c. Iul.*, the following two excerpts presumably come from book 16 and so are included here.

[143] Gk.: πάθος, so, alternatively, "passion."

[144] Cf. Patroclus' words to Achilles: "the sheer rocks gave you birth, since your mind is harsh" (Homer, *Il.* 16.35).

Fragment 49

Sacra: Letter upsilon, concerning arrogant and pompous people and those who are braggarts and vainglorious

> Pretentiousness nearly always has contempt as its root, and in some people it is born when an onslaught of haughtiness and bragging has preceded it. And what does it result in? Enmities, jealousies, and fits of rage,[145] like a fire
> [799] kindled from a tiny amount of cheap fuel that cannot be extinguished.[146]

From Book 17

Fragment 50

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning good bishops and those who guard the commandments of God
From the seventeenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> The leader who would be blameless must practice a disciplined and regimented life and must be experienced in all those things that are pleasing to God.

Fragment 51

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning good bishops and those who guard the commandments of God
From the same:

> Those whose role it is to lead and who, as it were, live in public and are more illustrious than others must surely adorn themselves with the beauty of a good life and must have honed to perfection a truly special way of life. The result will be that they even become models for the people placed under their care, as they do nothing ostentatiously or out of a desire for glory, but are eager to make their own conduct an inspiration also for others, for the sake of their edification. For the life of public and note-
> [800] worthy figures is almost constantly judged and scrutinized by everyone. And if he should continue to be beyond reproach, this fact will not be unprofitable for those who know him. But if he should be carried off from what is fitting and fall into what is impermissible, he will be a source, not of good, but rather of loss and damage to others. For if the instructor does not know how to keep to the straight path and follow a refined way of life, what kind of benefit can he provide to those under his instruction?

[145] Cf. Gal 5:20. [146] Cf. Jas 3:5–6, where the tongue is likened to a fire.

Fragment 52

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning those who serve God, that it is necessary for them to honor and revere [him] and make the required offerings
From the seventeenth book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> If someone among us was to be devoted to the exceptional life and be acclaimed for his brilliant way of living, it would no doubt follow without exception that he would be honored by others and no one would disbelieve him; rather, people would take his "yes" and "no" as having the force of an oath.[147] [801]

Fragment 53

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning people whose reasoning faculty is restless and whose judgment is unhinged
From the seventeenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> The beginning and root and, as it were, spring and origin of our internal passions is our appetite for vice, which at first calls the mind towards the passions and bewitches it, but afterwards also uses violence and shakes it until it collapses, even sometimes contrary to its will. For the appetites arise within us like smoke or even like vapors of innate pleasures. Now the sensible and vigorous person rebukes these stirrings and does not permit them to proceed further, and, because the passion is still feeble, he easily conquers it. But, in contrast, the careless and oblivious person admits the incipient pleasures, as though they were mere ideas, and, as he allows them to gain more and more ground, he will discover that the opposing force is incredibly difficult to contain. For the person who has already been taken captive and overpowered is no longer the master of his own inclinations but instead will be subject to the passion that has conquered him like a barbarian. Therefore, the primary method of self-control, which is best of all and most highly regarded, is neither to allow the initial stages of the passion nor indeed to be taken captive by yearnings. And after that method of self-control, there is also a second one that is full of filth: to choose to keep oneself from consummating the passion, once the mind is fastened to this yearning and is well acquainted with the defilement it brings. For it is better by far to prevent filth from falling into a jar altogether than to attempt to clean one that has already been defiled. [802]

[147] Cf. Matt 5:37; Jas 5:12.

Fragment 54

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning enemies and their downfall and that it is necessary not to rejoice at the misfortunes of our enemies
From the seventeenth book of Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> [Julian] unjustifiably chastises people who invoke God on behalf of those suffering torment, thinking they have gone beyond what is reasonable, and he says people who show compassion to evildoers are themselves evil. Yet in saying this isn't he giving approval to cruelty and savagery, and isn't he showing admiration for those who are both callous and hate others?[148] For I, at least, maintain that we should instead show compassion towards people who were once caught in their personal failures and have paid the penalty to the laws that punish, on grounds that they are faring miserably, have fallen into this state due to their human weakness, and have become prey to diabolical perversity. We ought not smirk at those who have fallen or, as it were, dance upon people lying on the ground[149] or show them a complete lack of affection.

Fragment 55

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning enemies and their downfall and that it is necessary not to rejoice at the misfortunes of our enemies
From the same:

> Goodness is splendid and worthy of emulation – by which I mean to extend mercy to those bent on hating us, to lend them a helping hand,
[803] and even to desire to save them, not by trampling upon them, or even, as it were, dancing on them as they lie on the ground[150] and pitilessly smirking at their inward misery, but instead by doing whatever would help them escape from the noose and offering prayers on their behalf to the God who rules over the universe.

Fragment 55a[151]

Sacra: Letter nu, concerning fasting and self-control
From the seventeenth book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

[148] The first two sentences of this passage are *c. Gal.* fr. 99 Mas.
[149] Cyril also adopted this exceedingly rare image in *Is.* 14:4–7; 16:7; 47:8–10 (PG 70.368d; 412d; 1008c); it seems not to have occurred in any earlier author.
[150] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 54.13 above with note.
[151] The present fragment was not included in the GCS edition of *c. Iul.* and was published for the first time in 2018 as part of a new edition of the *Sacra* (Declerck 2018). In Declerck's edition, this

> It is fitting that people who are fasting should do so motivated by their love for God and not practically shout aloud by their very appearance that they are enduring the hardship of abstaining from food, like some of those showmen in the theatre do who disguise themselves with a mask that appears morose and despondent.

From Book 18

Fragment 56

Sacra: Letter omicron, concerning conceit and appearance, and that being is better than seeming; for this is a hindrance to virtue[152]
From the same work:[153]

> There are some people, and they are many in this life, who cling tightly to what they themselves have uncritically assumed to be correct, and they suppose that all their words without exception are wise and indisputable. Nevertheless, they steal for themselves the reputation of being wise and clever persons only until the time comes when they encounter an argument from people who hold a different view which rises up against them with more vigorous proofs. [804]

Fragment 57

Sacra: Letter sigma, concerning a state of equilibrium and being disturbed by nothing
From the eighteenth book of Saint Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> Well-being is found in the principle "nothing overmuch," but excess is grounds for criticism.[154]

passage is II²2024 and appears on p.892; the heading appears on p.886. In order to preserve the enumeration of the fragments in the GCS edition and yet place this passage among the others belonging to book 17, we have designated it fr. 55a. In the German translation of *c. Iul.*, the fragment appears as Suppl. 1 (Ritter, Schramm, and Brüggemann 2023, 583).

[152] On our departure from the GCS edition for the title of this entry, see our note above at fr. 1.

[153] Since all but the last two lines of this fragment are repeated in the *Sacra* entry for "Letter phi, concerning self-love, and that one ought not justify or praise himself," where it is reported as "From the blessed Cyril's eighteenth book against Julian," also printed in Neumann's edition (where it is numbered as fr. 41), the fuller form of the fragment has been located here along with the other fragments from book 18.

[154] The maxim "nothing overmuch" (μηδὲν ἄγαν) appears in Plato, *Prt.* 343b, where it is said to be inscribed in the temple to Apollo at Delphi, and was widely quoted in antiquity. It was also mentioned, e.g., by Clement, *Str.* 1.14.61.1; 5.8.45.4; Hierocles, *in CA* 17.7.3; Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 1322.2.

Fragment 58

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning arguing with God and that one must not argue or plead one's case with God or say many words about him
From the eighteenth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> Lower your brow, O man. Put a locked door over your tongue.[155] Be done with such insipid nonsense. Leave it to the God over all to know and to do those things that are appropriate for him.

Fragment 59

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning the fact that God and his deeds are incomprehensible and that we must not seek after or investigate hidden things and things beyond what has been appointed for us; for the discovery of such things is beyond our reach, humans that we are, and is incomprehensible and also unprofitable
[805] From the eighteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> I think we must honor with faith those things that are beyond us, without testing them. For the human mind is arguably too weak to be able to understand them.[156]

Fragment 60

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning almsgiving and doing good deeds for the poor
From the eighteenth book by the same author:

> There is nothing that so cleanses us like the splendor of pious good deeds and showing compassion towards those in poverty who lack life's necessities.[157] For the author of Proverbs also writes at one point, "Sins are cleansed by acts of almsgiving and acts of faithfulness."[158]

Fragment 61

Sacra: Letter epsilon, concerning almsgiving and doing good deeds for the poor

[155] For this proverbial statement, see also John Chrysostom, *Virg.* 22.41; *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 6 (PG 62.534.37–38).
[156] Cf. *c. Iul.* 8.25.18–21; 8.38.23–28; 10.41.6–9. [157] Cf. *c. Iul.* fr. 31 above. [158] Prov 15:27.

From the same:

> No one accustomed to think rightly would doubt that the primary good deed, and the best one, is to distribute your belongings to those in need and suppress the opulence that riches bring and instead to heap up in heaven[159] a future hope, to exchange what is temporary for what is lasting, and to choose what endures instead of what is teetering. [806]

Fragment 62

Sacra: Letter alpha, concerning self-determination[160] and that self-determination has been given to us
From the eighteenth book of the same work:

> Each of the inhabitants of the earth has been allotted the reins of his own will, and, as a free agent,[161] hastens "hither or thither,"[162] that is, either towards virtue or towards worse actions.

Fragment 63

Sacra: Letter phi, concerning envy and those who are overcome by such a passion
From the eighteenth book of the blessed Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> People who lack a virtuous and admirable way of life understandably find it onerous that others are held in high esteem for their correct living and moral excellence. For they turn it into an indictment of their own immorality and, feeling weighed down by the good repute enjoyed by others, they harbor within themselves[163] the flame of jealousy. Yet they should have emulated them in choosing the better option and unfurled all their sails[164] in an effort to rival such illustrious deeds, instead of making achievements beyond their capabilities an occasion for disparaging others.

Fragment 64a

Sacra: Letter delta, concerning just people, that their death is honored by the Lord and that their memory is celebrated and when they die they are sought by everyone [807]

[159] Cf. Luke 12:33. [160] Gk.: αὐτεξουσίου. [161] Gk.: ἐθελοντής.
[162] Gk.: ἢ τὰν ἢ ἐπὶ τάν. On the meaning of this archaic phrase, see the note at *c. Iul.* 4.28.28.
[163] Gk.: ὠδίνουσι, literally, "they are pregnant with."
[164] Gk.: πάντα σείοντας κάλων, a nautical idiom literally meaning "shaking out every reefing rope"; cf., e.g., *Ador.* 14 (PG 68.937b); *Is.* 10:5–10 (PG 70.281a); *Ep. Fest.* 11.6.118–19, with Évieux's note *ad loc.* (1993, 290 n. 1).

From the eighteenth book of the same work:

> We honor the holy men who have kept the faith and have been most appropriately crowned with the glory of their courage, those who have endured the contest to the point of laying down their life and spilling their blood and who bear witness to Christ's glory and are resplendent with acts of pious virtue.[165]

Fragment 64b [pp.807–08, 890–91]

From the eighteenth book by the same author. When Julian ridiculed Christians who honor the martyrs, [Cyril] opposed him as follows:[166]

> For we do not regard those who have died as gods, nor do we ascribe to humans the worship we owe to God, nor do we extend petitions to the holy martyrs or ask them for the good things given to us by God. Instead, we honor [them] as holy men who have kept the faith and have been most appropriately crowned with the glory of excellent bravery, those who have gone as far as to lay down their lives and spill their blood in the struggle for victory and who bear witness to Christ's glory and are resplendent with the courage of virtue.

And a little further on, when [Cyril] says this is honored among the
[891] pagans as well:

> For at Athens they made sure to crown with annual honors the [warriors] who were foremost in endangering [themselves] on behalf of Hellas. And those who had a more cultivated tongue than the rest would approach them in their tombs and would strive nobly to win [oratorical contests] with [their] words. But they did not, for that reason, honor [them] as gods but as those who struggled for the salvation of everyone and were foremost in endangering [themselves] for the freedom of the Greeks.[167]

And a little further on, when [Cyril] says that the pagans' gods themselves were humans who were born, died, and decomposed, and rehearses the tombs of some of them, he says the following:

> Therefore, Zeus, who is highest of all, was buried in the cave of the Idaeans[168] and Dionysus [was buried] at the altar of the Apollo who is called "golden," and this Apollo who proclaimed oracles [was buried] beneath the Tripod that gives oracles. And they say that henceforth it was

[165] Cyril also discusses devotion to the martyrs at *c. Iul.* 6.28–30; 10.12–16; fr. 65.
[166] This incipit is *c. Gal.* fr. 110 Cra.
[167] Cf. *c. Iul.* 6.28.10–16; 10.13.1–28, where Cyril likewise refers to the contests of oratory held at Athens in honor of the war dead.
[168] Cyril also mentions Zeus's burial in the cave of Idaeus at *c. Iul.* 10.20.28–33; fr. 42. His source for this information was there named as Porphyry, *VP* 43.16–22.

called Tripod, on account of the three daughters of Triopas who mourned for the Pythian, the son of Zeus and Leto, when he died, as seemed right to Homer.[169]

Fragment 65

Florilegium Laurentianum: L[c] cap. A 7, 59
From the eighteenth book of the same work:

> But nor do we say that the holy martyrs themselves are gods; rather we know they were good humans and, on grounds that they fought nobly and gladly braved danger for the sake of piety towards him, we crown them with appropriate honors, awarding the verdict of excellence to the brilliance of their good deeds. For I think we ought to honor with undying memorial those who have won such a magnificent and valuable glory, and [809]
> who themselves even took no account of death's approach so that they might preserve for the one who bought them the authenticity of their faith. For we belong to Christ who went so far as to die for us; he obtained us by his own blood and we owe to him our own lives.

From Book 19

Fragment 66

Sacra: Letter sigma, concerning worldly wisdom
From the nineteenth book of the blessed Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*:

> Beautiful-sounding language and dazzling speech are very widespread among outsiders, despite the fact that these are completely useless. For they do not know the one who is God and Craftsman by nature but introduce innumerable gods into human life. [810]

Fragment 67 [pp.810, 891]

That our Lord ate the Passover according to the law with his disciples.
From the nineteenth book of Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> For in the first month, when a lamb was killed in accordance with the law of Moses, he foreknew that he too would suffer, and, as I said, went up to

[169] The burials of Dionysus and Apollo are also recounted at *c. Iul.* 10.20.6–26 (cf. fr. 42 above). There Cyril draws from Porphyry rather than Homer, and it seems that the closing phrase of this fragment only references Homer's description of Apollo as the "son of Zeus and Leto" (e.g., at *Il.* 1.9; cf. *HHApol* 545) rather than any account of their burials by the epic poet (furthermore, the epithet Pythios is not found in Homeric poetry, aside from *HHApol* 373).

Jerusalem aware of what would happen and kept the feast. For he ate the Passover with his disciples.[170] For his eating of the Passover can only mean they slaughtered a lamb on the fourteenth day of the month towards evening and ate the meat and unleavened bread with bitter herbs.

Fragments of Uncertain Location

Fragment 68

Sacra: Letter gamma, concerning a courageous, prudent, and wise woman
From Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

The female gender[171] is nearly always prone to tears and has a mind that
[811] easily crumbles into pity.

Fragment 69

Sacra: Letter pi, concerning a reckless, shameless, quick-tempered, passionate, and irritable person
From Cyril's *Against Julian*:

What sort of beast is so savage and wild as a quick-tempered man dominated by pure rage? And what sea breaks so furiously upon a rugged and rocky shore when violent winds rush over it, or what bitter and venomous serpent is there that so fiercely lunges at passersby, as an unruly and fierce man with an unbridled temper who has, as it were, given full rein to passion?[172]

Fragment 70

Sacra: Letter pi, concerning a reckless, shameless, quick-tempered, passionate, and irritable person

What could be worse than rage? For it turns a person into an ugly and cruel beast, making him callous and profane and leading him to regard the greatest of goods as of no account. For are there any wicked undertak-
[812] ings he would not attempt and are there any words he would hold back when he has within his mind an unquenchable flame and is boiling with wrath?

[170] Cf. Matt 26:17–19 and parallels. [171] Gk.: γένος.
[172] Similar imagery and language are found in *c. Iul.* 6.4.1–19.

Fragment 71

Sacra: Letter upsilon, concerning an insolent person
By the same author:

> Judgment instead sneaks up on those suffering from a lack of self-control in their speech.

Fragment 72

Philagathos, *Hom.* V.10 (= *c. Gal.* fr. 1 Bia.)[173]

But now that I've come to it, I have noticed the Greek nonsense that bears on our discussion. For those who have raged against the church and attempted to tear apart this sacred net have added the following to those other slanders belched forth from their stinking soul. "*If the disciples*," he says, "*were ordered to catch people like fish, just as in this passage 'You shall catch people' and elsewhere 'Come after me and I will make you fishers of people,'* [174] *and if fishermen lead their fish from life into death – for water is life for marine animals, but the air is death, just as the converse is true for land animals – if this is correct, then the disciples of* [813] *Jesus, by catching people through their preaching, are consigning them to death and destruction like fish.*" These are the words put forward by the defiled, reckless, and scornful tongue of Julian the transgressor, who has "the poison of asps under his lips,"[175] and "whose teeth are weapons and arrows,"[176] as the psalm says. Yet such sophisms are nothing more than the barking of mad dogs and the hissings of venomous snakes that fillet[177] the truth with their silly and deceptive fallacies.

Fragment 73

Philagathos, *Hom*. LXII (= *c. Gal.* fr. 2 Bia.)

But here again Julian's loathsome tongue has been honed "like a sharpened razor," to use the language of the Psalms,[178] mobilizing its customary weaponry

[173] Philagathos was a learned Italo-Greek monk and philosopher of the twelfth century. In the following three passages he does not explicitly acknowledge his dependence upon Cyril's *Against Julian* for the Julianic material he reports, but the GCS editors highlight the presence of typically Cyrilline language in the way he sets up the quotations from Julian, which suggests he was drawing upon Cyril (Riedweg, GCS 20, XVIII n. 34). None of this material from Philagathos (i.e., *c. Iul.* frs. 72, 73, 74) was included in Masaracchia's edition of *c. Gal.*, though the last of the Philagathos fragments (*c. Iul.* fr. 74) reports a criticism of Julian that was also mentioned by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Photius, which is *c. Gal.* fr. 100 Mas. These passages were first highlighted by Bianchi 2006.

[174] Luke 5:10; Matt 4:19. [175] Ps 13(14):3; Rom 3:13. [176] Ps 56(57):5.

[177] Gk.: τεμαχίζοντα, literally, "cut up fish for salting." Note that Philagathos is turning on Julian the halieutic imagery Julian had himself criticized.

[178] Cf. Ps 51(52):4.

of verbal onslaught, and he mocks this statement and ridicules the promise, saying, "*If this is true, then those who believe in Jesus and have, <for his sake>,*[179] *rejected their wives ought to receive a hundred wives in place of the one they rejected*."[180] Now perhaps one should run past his nonsensical utterances like the barking of a dog. But lest his clever trick should sweep away those who are rather
[814] simpleminded, we note that he did not promise a repayment that was of the same form, nor did he say he would in return furnish them with wives and fields, but rather, in place of things that pass away, things that remain, and, in place of sensible things, intelligible things that transcend our sight, hearing, and thought.

Fragment 74

Philagathos, *Hom*. LXVI (= *c. Gal.* fr. 3 Bia.)

> Here that serpent who in the beginning said slanderous things about God to the human being has once more, through the defiled and spiteful tongue of Julian, given a dreadful hiss. For this man, intending to show the futility of Christ's mandate, tries to outsmart others with the following hypothetical fallacy: *"If all people*," he says, "*were persuaded by this mandate and accordingly chose to sell their possessions and distribute the money to the poor, who would there then be to buy what was sold, when, in keeping with the suggestion put forward here, everyone was selling?*"[181] You have heard the absurdity of the sophist's wickedness. Come now, let us crush[182] the liar's teeth[183] with the cornerstone of the truth.[184]

Fragment 75 [pp.815, 891–92][185]

George of B'eltan's *Commentary on Matthew*, Vat. syr. 154, fol. 10v a

[179] Following the emendation of Scorso (and adopted by Bianchi and the GCS editors).

[180] Cf. Matt 19:29; Mark 10:29; Luke 18:29–30. Note that, of the three synoptic parallel passages, only Luke mentions wives as something forsaken for Jesus' sake, although the promise of receiving something back one hundred times over appears in Matthew's and in Mark's version.

[181] Cf. Matt 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 18:22. Julian's criticism of the dominical command of poverty was also noted by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*c. Iul.* fr. 6 Guida; preserved in a catena on Luke 12:33–34) and Photius (*Ep*. 187.2–15 Laourdas and Westerink), and was previously published as *c. Gal.* fr. 100 Mas. Julian also mocked the Christian ideal of poverty in a letter concerning the "Arian" Christians in Edessa (*Ep*. 115 Bidez [= *Ep*. 40 Wright]), stating that he was taking away their property to help them fulfill their master's command.

[182] The GCS text here mistakenly reads θσυνθλάσωμεν for συνθλάσωμεν.

[183] Cf. Ps 3:8(7); 57(58):7.

[184] Cf. Eph 2:20; 1 Pet 2:6.

[185] Although this fragment does not mention Cyril, George names Cyril's *Against Julian* as a source elsewhere in his commentary (see *c. Iul.* fr. 3b), so the Julianic criticisms in frs. 75 and 76 probably also came from there. It is possible that George's rebuttal of Julian's objections also drew upon Cyril's own response. Cf. Kaufhold's discussion in GCS 21, 826–27.

But Julian raised the following objection to this:[186] *if Luke recorded the legal genealogy, why does he call Obed the son of Boaz and not the son of Mahlon instead, since it was for Mahlon that Boaz, in accordance with the law, begot [Obed] from Ruth, whom he had taken in order to raise up a descendant for Mahlon?*[187]

This cunning man does not understand that the dispute concerned Joseph, specifically whether or not he had descended from David. But [for the section of the genealogy] from David to Abraham there was no ambiguity about this point, given that all Jews were descended from Abraham. Thus [it was only for the section of the genealogy] up to David[188] that he was careful to record the succession in keeping with the stipulations of the law, which is confirmed by Eusebius and George. [892]

[186] The following paragraph is *c. Gal.* fr. 111 Cra. Theodore bar Koni and Isho'dad of Merv also pass on versions of this objection (= Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c. Iul.* test.1 Guida). Isho'dad in fact attributes the objection to both Porphyry and Julian, leading Becker to include it in his edition of Porphyry's *Contra Christianos* as 54T. It was later mentioned by Dionysius bar Salibi in his *Commentarii in Evangelia* (Sedlácek and Chabot 1906, 58 [Syriac]; ibid., 43 [Latin]). Jerome also reported that Julian criticized the contradictions between the genealogies, though he provided a less detailed account of Julian's argument that obscured its sophistication (*Comm. in Mt.* 1:16 [= Julian, *c. Gal.* fr. 90 Mas.]). At *c. Gal.* fr. 62 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.2.18–23) Julian mentioned in passing that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke were discordant, and in *c. Gal.* fr. 64 Mas. (= *c. Iul.* 8.15.9–10) he signalled his intention to discuss the genealogies more fully in his now mostly lost second book. The criticism raised above probably derives from the promised discussion in *Against the Galileans* book 2 that has not otherwise survived. At *Cels*. 2.32, Origen criticized Celsus for failing to raise the difficulty of the discrepancy between Jesus' two genealogies, perhaps prompting Julian to focus on this issue.

[187] Cf. Luke 3:32; Ruth 1:1–4; 4:9–10, 13–22. Julian's objection seems to be a response to Eusebius' solution to the discordant genealogies in Matthew and Luke. Eusebius, following Julius Africanus, argued that Matthew was recording Joseph's biological lineage, while Luke recorded his legal lineage, which differed thanks to the ancient Israelite custom of Levirate marriage, according to which a man was obliged to marry a widow of a deceased relative and raise up descendants for the dead husband (Eusebius, *H.e.* 1.7.1–17; *Qu. Steph.* 4). Julian's corresponding objection would seem to be, "If Luke was recording the legal genealogy of Joseph, as Eusebius claims, he should have listed Mahlon as Obed's father, since Boaz's marriage to Ruth was an instance of Levirate marriage. The fact that he didn't shows that Luke was in fact *not* recording legal descent and the contradiction between his genealogy and that of Matthew therefore remains." George responds by explaining that Luke was only intending to record Joseph's descent in legal terms for a portion of his genealogy, specifically the period between Joseph and David. Since Julian's counterexample comes from the other section of the genealogy in which, according to George, legal descent was not disputed, his objection loses its force.

[188] To understand this passage, it is important to recognize that George is moving chronologically backward in time rather than forward, in keeping with the arrangement of the Lukan genealogy of Jesus, which begins with Joseph and ends with Adam. Hence, the phrase "up to David" means "the section of the genealogy counting backwards chronologically from Joseph to David."

Fragment 76 [pp.815, 892]

George of B'eltan's *Commentary on Matthew*, Vat. syr. 154, fol. 26r b

Julian here says, "Why, when frankincense was offered to Christ,[189] do you yourselves not burn frankincense but a perfume compound instead?"[190] Those who offered frankincense did not offer [it] because our Lord asked this from them, and he accepted their own understanding [of it], not looking at the gift [itself] but at the intention of those offering it. And we honor the holy temples with the fragrance of sweet perfumes so that those who enter them might enjoy it.

Fragment 77 [pp.816, 892][191]

Isho'dad of Merv, *Commentary on John*

But the reprobate Julian, along with others, severely criticizes John at this point[192] for having uttered an obvious falsehood with these words, since the world could record and narrate not only what Jesus did in three and a half years but also all the stories from the beginning [of time] until the present.[193] And we hold that John sometimes calls the entire creation "the world," as in the passage "the world came to be through him";[194] sometimes people, as in the passage "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son for it";[195] sometimes people who fear God, as in the passage "I am the light of the world";[196] and sometimes wicked people, as in the passage "the world will rejoice and you will grieve"[197] and in the passage "the ruler of this world is cast down,"[198] that is, Satan, the prince of the evil ones. This is also the case here. He is calling evil people "the world" that cannot grasp the books of Jesus' deeds. And this is clear from the fact that they do not grasp even the books they *were* able to grasp.[199] For just as, for example, the evangelists omitted the many deeds that he, as it is

[189] Cf. Matt 2:11.

[190] This sentence is *c. Gal.* fr. 112 Cra. Julian's criticism was later repeated by Dionysius bar Salibi in his *Commentarii in Evangelia* (Sedlácek and Chabot 1906, 109 [Syriac text]; ibid., 81 [Latin translation]). According to Susan Ashbrook Harvey, Egeria's description of the Jerusalem liturgy circa 381 "is the only mention of liturgical use [of incense] of which we can be certain at this early date" (Harvey 2006, 77). If so, then Julian's reference to it here could be our earliest mention, predating Egeria by a couple of decades.

[191] Although Isho'dad does not mention Cyril in this passage, it was included in the GCS edition, since Cyril might have been his source. Cf. Kaufhold's discussion in GCS 21, 827.

[192] The passage in view is John 21:25, which Isho'dad has just cited.

[193] This sentence is *c. Gal.* fr. 113 Cra. As noted by Kaufhold (GCS 21, 827 n. 32), the anonymous Syriac catena on the gospels in Ming. syr. 480 contains a version of this same criticism of the final verse of the fourth gospel, although it attributes it to both Julian and Porphyry. Porphyry is probably the person Isho'dad has in mind with his allusion to "others" in the present passage.

[194] John 1:10. [195] John 3:16. [196] John 8:12. [197] John 16:20. [198] John 12:31.

[199] Isho'dad's point relies on the polysemy of the Syriac verb ܬܫܥ which can mean "to grasp" both in the sense of "to understand" as well as "to contain" (similar to the Greek verb καταλαμβάνω which is used in John 1:5). Thus, when the evangelist says the world could not *contain* the books of Jesus' deeds, this means evil people could not *understand* them.

written,[200] did in Chorazin and in Bethsaida, so too they omitted and did not mention the other mighty deeds that he performed elsewhere.

Fragment 78 [pp.816–18]

Severus, *History of the Patriarchs*[201]

When Cyril received what the emperor had written, he was very happy and started writing the holy treatises to refute the blasphemies of the irreligious Julian. He brought some incisive accusations down upon him, such as:

> You have defamed Roman power, though God sent you out in battle like Saul. From the time the Romans sided with Christ, none of their emperors has ever fallen in battle, except you,[202] because you left him, even though you yourself have stood before his sanctuary, and have yourself served before the Lord. What evil have you seen in the church?
>
> You have loved the darkness more than the light, you have loved the bad over the good, violence over speaking justice. You loved all talk of baptism […] and a deceitful tongue. This is why the Lord knocked you down until, grabbing you and taking you from where you live, "he has uprooted you from the land of the living,"[203] because you have never seen Jesus; and I say you are an object of hatred to him or that like a high priest he has convicted you, because you have never seen him in his humility, that is, the one you have not known in his wisdom like them; but he is the one you've seen the whole world worshipping: it is his divinity you've seen everyone believing in, it is his church you've seen with the cohort of martyrs who died for him. You trembled, but still didn't recognize him, nor have you ever seen him. You have hated as something evil the one who molded you, who molded everyone. You didn't spare the one who treated you well, but rather you insulted him with […] words […]. You

[200] Cf. Matt 11:21; Luke 10:13. As Isho'dad observes, the canonical gospels in fact record no deeds performed by Jesus in Chorazin, though these passages in Matthew and Luke allude to such deeds. In Mark 8:22–26 Jesus does, however, heal a blind man just outside of Bethsaida, and the feeding of the 5,000 in Luke 9:10–17 takes place near Bethsaida.

[201] Fragment 78 is the sole portion of *c. Iul.* surviving in Coptic, if it is indeed an authentic *testimonium* to the treatise. We are grateful to Adam Bremer-McCollum who provided us with a translation of the passage to include here.

[202] If this passage accurately reports the content of Cyril's *Against Julian*, the present sentence would be the only reference to some detail of Julian's life in the entire treatise, aside from the mention of his apostasy in the "Dedication" and a handful of other times in later books. Alternatively, the fact that Cyril nowhere else alludes to such details might cast doubt upon the authenticity of this supposed summary of his arguments in the treatise. In the introduction to their collection of fragments, Kinzig and Brüggemann express some uncertainty about the passage themselves (GCS 21, 758). See also Brüggemann 2020, 162–63.

[203] Ps 51(52):7.

> sharpened your tongue against God with insulting language – won't you stop throwing it in his face … ?

Fragment 79[204]

Concerning excellent men, that their contribution brings salvation both for the ones acting and indeed for the people as well.
From Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> For I, at least, maintain that the soundness of the entire commonwealth and its enjoyment of favorable circumstances comes from nowhere else than the good judgment of the best and most outstanding men, just as we have accurately perceived also in the case of those distinguished men in ancient days, who were renowned for their sagacity, the very thing ignored by this noble man who thought his peculiar madness would be all the good judgment he required.

Fragment 80[205]

Concerning kings, that it is unprofitable for them to march out to war
From Saint Cyril's *Against Julian*:

> For it is fitting that kings should lavish frequent gifts upon those of their subjects who excel in prudence and strength, so that when they march out to wars, they would use their tactical skill to manage the people's commonwealth and ward off enemies, and, when they return, bring the spoils to those same ones who stay at home in palaces.

[204] The present fragment and the subsequent one were not included in the GCS edition of *c. Iul.* and were published for the first time in 2019 as part of a new edition of the *Sacra* (Declerck and Thum 2019). In Declerck and Thum's edition, *c. Iul.* fr. 79 is II suppl. 21 and appears on p.261; the heading appears on p.257. In the German translation of *c. Iul.*, the fragment appears as Suppl. 2 (Ritter, Schramm, and Brüggemann 2023, 584).

[205] *c. Iul.* fr. 80 is taken from Declerck and Thum 2019, 283–84, where the passage is designated II suppl. 65. Cf. the previous note. In the German translation of *c. Iul.*, the fragment appears as Suppl. 3 (Ritter, Schramm, and Brüggemann 2023, 584).

Appendix

A Concordance of the Fragments of *Against the Galileans* in *Against Julian*

We are aware that some of our readers will be more interested in the words of Julian than those of Cyril, so we have provided the table below to make it easier to find the fragments of *c. Gal.* preserved in *c. Iul.* The fragments are numbered according to Masaracchia 1990, Bianchi 2006, and Crawford 2023a. The corresponding page numbers of Wright's 1923 edition and translation are noted as well for comparison.

Julian, *c. Gal.* fragment number	Location in Cyril, *c. Iul.*	Page numbers in Wright 1923
fr. 1 Mas.	2.2	pp.318–19
fr. 2 Mas.	2.7	pp.318–19
fr. 3 Mas.	2.9	pp.318–21
fr. 4 Mas.	2.11	pp.324–25
fr. 5 Mas.	2.13	–
fr. 6 Mas.	2.18–19	pp.328–33
fr. 7 Mas.	2.23	pp.320–23
fr. 8 Mas.	2.31	pp.332–33
fr. 9 Mas.	2.32–33	pp.332–37
fr. 10 Mas.	2.43–44	pp.336–39
fr. 11 Mas.	2.50	pp.322–23
fr. 12 Mas.	2.55	–
fr. 13 Mas.	3.1	pp.324–25

Julian, *c. Gal.* fragment number	Location in Cyril, *c. Iul.*	Page numbers in Wright 1923
fr. 14 Mas.	3.10	–
fr. 15 Mas.	3.20	pp.324–25
fr. 16 Mas.	3.23	pp.324–27
fr. 17 Mas.	3.29	pp.326–29
fr. 18 Mas.	3.33	pp.328–29
fr. 19 Mas.	3.37	pp.338–43
fr. 20 Mas.	3.46	pp.342–45
fr. 21 Mas.	4.2	pp.344–47
fr. 22 Mas.	4.24	pp.346–49
fr. 23 Mas.	4.29	pp.348–51
fr. 24 Mas.	4.33	pp.350–55
fr. 25 Mas.	4.38	pp.354–55
fr. 26 Mas.	4.40	pp.354–57
fr. 27 Mas.	4.43	pp.356–59
fr. 28 Mas.	4.46	pp.358–59
fr. 29 Mas.	5.2	pp.358–61
fr. 30 Mas.	5.6	pp.360–63
fr. 31 Mas.	5.12	pp.362–63
fr. 32 Mas.	5.12	–
fr. 33 Mas.	5.13	pp.362–65
fr. 34 Mas.	5.23	–
fr. 35 Mas.	5.24	pp.364–65
fr. 36 Mas.	5.28	pp.364–67
fr. 37 Mas.	5.33	pp.366–67
fr. 38 Mas.	5.36	pp.368–69
fr. 39 Mas.	6.1	pp.368–69
fr. 40 Mas.	6.10	pp.368–71
fr. 41 Mas.	6.11	pp.376–77

Julian, *c. Gal.* fragment number	Location in Cyril, *c. Iul.*	Page numbers in Wright 1923
fr. 42 Mas.	6.14	pp.370–71
fr. 43 Mas.	6.15	pp.370–73
fr. 44 Mas.	6.19	pp.372–73
fr. 45 Mas.	6.20	pp.372–73
fr. 46 Mas.	6.22; 8.50	pp.374–75
fr. 47 Mas.	6.25	pp.374–77
fr. 48 Mas.	6.31	pp.376–77
fr. 49 Mas.	6.37	pp.378–79
fr. 50 Mas.	6.42	pp.378–81
fr. 51 Mas.	7.1	pp.380–83
fr. 52 Mas.	7.4	–
fr. 53 Mas.	7.6	pp.382–83
fr. 54 Mas.	7.9	pp.382–85
fr. 55 Mas.	7.16	pp.384–87
fr. 56 Mas.	7.22	–
fr. 57 Mas.	7.24	pp.386–89
fr. 58 Mas.	7.28	pp.388–91
fr. 59 Mas.	7.38	pp.390–93
fr. 60 Mas.	7.44	–
fr. 61 Mas.	7.45	–
fr. 62 Mas.	8.1–2	pp.392–97
fr. 63 Mas.	8.6	–
fr. 64 Mas.	8.15–16	pp.396–401
fr. 65 Mas.	8.34	pp.400–01
fr. 66 Mas.	9.1	–
fr. 67 Mas.	9.2	pp.400–03
fr. 68 Mas.	9.11	–
fr. 69 Mas.	9.13	–

Julian, *c. Gal.* fragment number	Location in Cyril, *c. Iul.*	Page numbers in Wright 1923
fr. 70 Mas.	9.14	pp.402–05
fr. 71 Mas.	9.21	pp.404–05
fr. 72 Mas.	9.22	pp.404–07
fr. 73 Mas.	9.31	–
fr. 74 Mas.	9.32	pp.406–09
fr. 75 Mas.	9.39	pp.408–11
fr. 76 Mas.	9.46	pp.426–27
fr. 77 Mas.	9.47	–
fr. 78 Mas.	9.47	–
fr. 79 Mas.	10.1	pp.412–13
fr. 80 Mas.	10.8	pp.412–15
fr. 81 Mas.	10.11	pp.414–17
fr. 82 Mas.	10.17	pp.416–17
fr. 83 Mas.	10.22	pp.416–19
fr. 84 Mas.	10.26	pp.418–21
fr. 85 Mas.	10.31	pp.420–23, 426–27
fr. 86 Mas.	10.34	pp.422–23
fr. 87 Mas.	10.37	pp.422–25
fr. 88 Mas.	10.39	pp.424–27
fr. 89 Mas.	10.42	–
fr. 91a (= fr. 91 Mas.)	fr. 3a	–
fr. 91b	fr. 3b	–
fr. 96 Mas.	fr. 28	–
fr. 97 Mas.	fr. 30	–
fr. 98 Mas.	fr. 39	–
fr. 99 Mas.	fr. 54	–
fr. 108 Cra.	fr. 41	–
fr. 109 Cra.	fr. 43	–

Julian, *c. Gal.* fragment number	Location in Cyril, *c. Iul.*	Page numbers in Wright 1923
fr. 110 Cra.	fr. 64b	–
fr. 111 Cra.	fr. 75	–
fr. 112 Cra.	fr. 76	–
fr. 113 Cra.	fr. 77	–
fr. 1 Bia.	fr. 72	–
fr. 2 Bia.	fr. 73	–
fr. 3 Bia. (cf. fr. 100 Mas.)	fr. 74	–

Bibliography

Included in this bibliography are only the critical editions and translations that we cited explicitly in the introduction and notes to the translation, or for which there are multiple or obscure editions. As a general rule, we have tended to use the editions included in the TLG, except where more recent or superior editions are available. For other works referenced in the notes, we have adopted the abbreviations of LSJ, Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, or the *SBL Handbook of Style*.

The introductions, supplementary notes, translation, or critical apparatuses of the recent editions of the *c. Iul.* in the GCS (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller) and SC (Sources chrétiennes) series are referenced hundreds of times in the footnotes. In order to alert the reader to their unique status, material in these volumes is referred to by the relevant editorial contributor and the GCS or SC volume number (rather than the author and date, as in the case of all other sources). The editorial contributors cited are Riedweg or Kinzig (in GCS 20), Brüggemann, Kinzig, or Kaufhold (in GCS 21), Burguière or Évieux (in SC 332), and Boulnois (in SC 582 and 624).

Julian's *Against the Galileans*

Neumann, Karl Johannes, ed. 1880a. *Iuliani Imperatoris Librorum Contra Christianos Quae Supersunt*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

1880b. *Kaiser Julians Bücher gegen die Christen*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Wright, Wilmer Cave. 1923. "Against the Galileans." In *The Works of the Emperor Julian, Volume III*. LCL 157. Pages 311–427. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Masaracchia, Emanuela. 1990. *Giuliano Imperatore, Contra Galilaeos: Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Bianchi, Nunzio. 2006. "Nuovi frammenti del *Contra Galilaeos* di Giuliano (dalle omelie di Filagato da Cerami)." *BollClass* 27: 89–104.

Giavatto, Angelo and Robert Muller. 2018. *Julien l'Empereur: Contre les Galiléens*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Crawford, Matthew R. 2023a. "Towards a New Edition of Julian's *Contra Galilaeos*: Assessing the Material from the Syriac Transmission of Cyril's *Contra Iulianum*." *Classical Quarterly* 72: 850–67.

Cyril's *Against Julian*

Oecolampadius, J. 1546. "Contra Iulianum apostatam pro religione Christiana libros X." In *Operum divi Cyrilli Alexandrini Episcopi Tomi Quatuor, Volume III*. Cols. 1–253. Basel.

Aubert, Jean. 1638. "Sancti Cyrilli Alexandriae Archiepiscopi Pro sancta Christianorum religione adversus libros athei Iuliani libri X." In *S. P. N. Cyrilli Alexandriae Archiepiscopi operum tomus sextus*. Paris: Regiis Typis.

Burguière, Paul and Pierre Évieux. 1985. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Contre Julien, Tome I: Livres I et II*. SC 322. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Boulnois, Marie-Odile. 2016. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Contre Julien, Tome II: Livres III–V*. SC 582. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Riedweg, Christoph and Wolfram Kinzig. 2016. *Kyrill von Alexandrien I: Gegen Julian, Teil 1: Buch 1–5*. GCS 20. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kaufhold, Hubert. 2017. "Die syrischen Fragmente." In *Kyrill von Alexandrien I: Gegen Julian, Teil 2: Buch 6–10 und Fragmente*. GCS 21. Pages 821–95. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kinzig, Wolfram and Thomas Brüggemann. 2017. *Kyrill von Alexandrien I: Gegen Julian, Teil 2: Buch 6–10 und Fragmente*. GCS 21. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Boulnois, Marie-Odile. 2021. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Contre Julien, Tome IV: Livres VIII–IX*. SC 624. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Huber-Rebenich, Gerlinde, Stefan Rebenich, and Michael Schramm. 2023. *Kyrill von Alexandrien. Gegen Julian. Bd. I.* Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 94.1. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.

Ritter, Adolf Martin, Michael Schramm, and Thomas Brüggemann. 2023. *Kyrill von Alexandrien. Gegen Julian. Bd. II*. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 94.2. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.

Julian's Other Works

Bidez, Joseph. 1932. *L'empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes, Tome I, 1re partie: Discours de Julien César (I–V)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

1924. *L'empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes, Tome I, 2e partie: Lettres et Fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Lacombrade, Christian. 1965. *L'empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes, Tome II, 2e partie: Discours de Julien Empereur (X–XII)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther. 2015. *Iulianus Augustus: Opera*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rochefort, Gabriel. 1963. *L'empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes, Tome II, 1re partie: Discours de Julien Empereur (VI–IX)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Wright, Wilmer Cave. 1913–23. *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. Three volumes. LCL 13, 29, 157. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cyril's Other Works

Ador.	*De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate.*
	Villani, Barbara. 2021. *Kyrill von Alexandrien: De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate. Buch 1*. TU 190. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Agg., Mal., Mich., Nah., Os., Zach.	*Commentarii in Aggaeum, Malachiam, Michaeam, Nahum, Oseam, Zachariam*
	Pusey, P. E. 1868. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in xii prophetas*. Two volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Dial. Trin.	*Dialogi de Trinitate*
	de Durand, Georges-Matthieu. 1976/1977/1978. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Dialogues sur la Trinité*. Three volumes. SC 231, 237, 246. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
Ep.	*Epistulae*
	Wickham, Lionel R. 1983. *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Ep. Fest.	*Epistulae Festales sive Homiliae Paschales*
	Aubert, J. 1864. *S. P. N. Cyrilli Opera Omnia. Tome X*. Patrologia Graeca 77. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
	Évieux, P., L. Arragon, M.-O. Boulnois, M. Forrat, B. Meunier, and W. H. Burns. 1991. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres Festales I–VI*. SC 372. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
	Évieux, P., L. Arragon, R. Monier, and W. H. Burns. 1993. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres Festales VII–XI*. SC 392. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
	Burns, W. H., M.-O. Boulnois, and B. Meunier. 1998. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Lettres Festales XII–XVII*. SC 434. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
	Amidon, Philip R. and John J. O'Keefe. 2009. *Cyril of Alexandria: Festal Letters 1–12*. FOC 118. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Hom. Lc. *Homiliae in Lucae Evangelium*

Payne Smith, Robert. 1858. *S. Cyrilli Alexandriae Archiepiscopi Commentarii in Lucae Evangelium*. Oxford: Typographeo Academico.

Sickenberger, J. 1909. *Fragmente der Homilien des Cyrill von Alexandrien zum Lukasevangelium*. TU 34. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Jo. *Commentarii in Joannis Evangelium*

Pusey, P. E. 1872. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*. Three volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Volume III also contains the fragments of Cyril's Pauline commentaries and fragments of diverse homilies]

Mt. *Commentarii in Matthaei Evangelium*

Reuss, J. 1957. *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*. TU 61. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Other Ancient Sources

Aetius

Plac. *Placita*

Mansfeld, Jaap and David T. Runia. 2020. *Aëtiana V: An Edition of the Reconstructed Text of the* Placita *with a Commentary and a Collection of Related Texts*. Leiden: Brill.

Alexander of Aphrodisias

de Fato

Thillet, P. 1984. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise: Traité du Destin*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

de Prov. *de Providentia*

Riedweg, Christoph. 2011. "Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Prouidentia*: Greek Fragments and Arabic Versions." In *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, edited by Dirk Obbink and Richard Rutherford, 277–301. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thillet, P. 2003. *Alexandre d'Aphrodise: Traité de la providence (Peri pronoias, version Arabe de Abu Bissar Matthae ibn Yunus. Intr. ed. et trad.)*. Lagrasse: Verdier.

Alexander Polyhistor

Fr. *Fragmenta*

Jacoby, Felix. 1923–58/1991–. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (*= FGrHist*)*. Leiden: Brill.

Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia

Beatrice, Pierre Franco. 2001. *Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia*. Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 56. Leiden: Brill.

Aristoxenus

Fr. *Fragmenta (vita Socratis)*

Wehrli, F. 1967. *Aristoxenos*. Die Schule des Aristoteles. Volume 11, 2nd edn. Basel: Schwabe.

Athanasius

Gent. *contra Gentes*

Thomson, Robert W. 1971. *Athanasius:* Contra Gentes *and* De Incarnatione. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Athenaeus

Deipn. *Deipnosophistae*

Kaibel, Georg. 1887–90. *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum libri 15*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Atticus

Fr. *Fragmenta*

Baudry, J. 1931. *Atticos: Fragments de son oeuvre*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Augustine

C. D. *Civitas Dei*

Bettenson, Henry. 1984. *Augustine: The City of God*. New York: Penguin Classics.

Dombart, Bernardus and Alfonsus Kalb, eds. 1993. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Episcopi De Civitate Dei Libri XXII*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

Catenae Graecorum Patrum

Cramer, J. A. 1844. *Catenae Graecorum Patrum*. Eight volumes. Oxford: Typographeo Academico.

Chrysippus

SVF *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*

Von Arnim, J. 1903. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*. Volume II. Leipzig: Teubner.

Corpus Hermeticum (Hermes Trismegistus)

Corp.Herm. *Corpus Hermeticum*

Copenhaver, Brian P. 1992. *Hermetica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Litwa, M. David. 2018. *Hermetica II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nock, A. D. and A.-J. Festugière. 1946. (Tomes I– II)/1954 (Tomes III– IV). *Corpus Hermeticum*. 4 volumes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Didymus the Blind

Gen. *On Genesis*

Nautin, Pierre and Louis Doutreleau. 1976. *Didyme l'Aveugle: Sur la Genèse I*. SC 233. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Nautin, Pierre and Louis Doutreleau. 1978. *Didyme l'Aveugle: Sur la Genèse II*. SC 244. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Trin. (?) *De Trinitate*

Hönscheid, Jürgen. 1975. *Didymus der Blinde: De Trinitate, Buch 1*. Meisenheim: Anton Hain.

Zach. *On Zachariah*

Doutreleau, Louis. 1962. *Didyme l'Aveugle sur Zacharie*. Three volumes. SC 83, 84, 85. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Dionysius Bar Salibi

Commentarii in Evangelia

Sedlácek, I. and I.-B. Chabot. 1906. *Dionysii bar Salibi Commentarii in Evangelia*. Two volumes. CSCO 15–16. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

Empedocles

Laks, André and Glenn W. Most. 2016. *Early Greek Philosophy. Volume V: Western Greek Thinkers, Part 2*. LCL 528. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.

Epiphanius

Anc., Haer. *Ancoratus, Panarion adversus Haereses*

Holl, Karl. 1915. *Epiphanius I: Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33*. GCS 25. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Eunapius

VS *Vitae Philosophorum et Sophistarum*

Goulet, R. 2014. *Eunape de Sardes: Vies de philosophes et de sophistes*. Collection des Universités de France. Série grecque 508. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Eupolemus

Freudenthal, J. 1875. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Hellenistische Studien I–II. Breslau: Skutsch.

Euripides

Ba. *Bacchae*

Dodds. E. R. 1986. *Euripides*: *Bacchae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fr. *Fragmenta*

Jouan, F. and H. Van Looy. 1998. *Euripide. Fragments, 1ère Partie*. Volume VIII. Paris: L'Association Guillaume Budé.

Kannicht, R. 2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Volume v: Euripides*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Alc., Hipp., Or., Tr. *Alcestis, Hippolytus, Orestes, Troades*

Diggle, J. 1984–94. *Euripidis Fabulae*. Three volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Eusebius of Caesarea

Chron. *Chronicon*

Aucher, J. B. 1818. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopi: Chronicon bipartitum, ex Arm. textu in Lat. conversum, adnotationibus auctum, Gr. fragmentis exornatum*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Karst, J. 1911. *Eusebius Werke Bd. v: Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt*. GCS 20. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

D.e. *Demonstratio Evangelica*

Heikel, I., ed. 1913. *Eusebius Werke VI. Die Demonstratio Evangelica*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hierocl. (?) *contra Hieroclem*

Forrat, Marguerite and Édouard des Places. 1986. *Eusèbe de Césarée: Contre Hiéroclès*. SC 333. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Onomast. *Onomasticon*

Timm, Stefan. 2017. *Eusebius Werke. Dritter Band. Erster Teil, Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*. GCS 24. Berlin: De Gruyter.

P.e. *Praeparatio Evangelica*

Mras, K. 1954. *Eusebius Werke VIII. Die Praeparatio Evangelica*. GCS 43.1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Theoph. *Theophania*

Gressmann, Hugo and Adolf Laminski. 1992. *Eusebius Werke 3/2. Die Theophanie*. GCS 11/2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Eusebius of Emesa

Commentary on Genesis

ter Haar Romeny, R. B. 1997. *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis*. Traditio Exegetica Graeca 6. Leuven: Peeters.

Flor. Cyrill.	*Florilegium Cyrillianum*
	Hespel, Robert. 1955. *Le florilège cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d'Antioche*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 37. Louvain: Université de Louvain.

Gregory of Nyssa

Hom. in Cant.	*Homiliae in Cantica Canticorum*
Or. Catech.	*Oratio Catechetica*
	Jaeger, Werner and Hermann Langerbeck. 1960–92. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. Leiden: Brill.
Nativ.	*Homilia de Nativitate*
	Mann, Friedhelm. 1975. "Die Weihnachtspredigt Gregors von Nyssa. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text." Dissertation, Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster.

Ps-Gregory of Nyssa

Test.	*Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*
	Albl, M. C. 2004. *Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa: Testimonies against the Jews*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Heraclitus

Fr.	*Fragmenta*
	Diels, H. and W. Kranz. 1951. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Volume 1. 6th edn. Berlin: Weidmann.
	Laks, André and Glenn W. Most. 2016. *Early Greek Philosophy*. Volume III. LCL 526. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.

Hermias

in Phdr.	*in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*
	Lucarini, C. M. and C. Moreschini. 2012. *Hermias Alexandrinus: In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Hist.copt.eccl.Alex.	*Historia Coptica Ecclesiasticae Alexandrinae*

Orlandi, T. 1968–70. *Storia della Chiesa di Alessandria*. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 17, 31. Milan; Varese: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino.

Homer

Il. *Iliad*

Munro, D. B. and T. W. Allen, eds. 1920. *Homeri Opera*. Volume 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Iamblichus

Myst. *De Mysteriis Aegyptorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum (= Response of the Master Abamon to the Letter of Porphyry to Anebo)*

Clarke, Emma, John Dillon, and Jackson Hershbell. 2003. *Iamblichus: On the Mysteries*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Isho'dad of Merv

Commentary on Luke

Gibson, Margaret Dunlop. 1911. *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv in Syriac and English*. Three volumes. Cambridge: University Press.

Isigonus of Nicaea

Paradox. *Paradoxa*

Giannini, Alessandro. 1966. *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano.

Ps-John of Damascus

Sacra

Declerck, José. 2018. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos VIII/7, Sacra, Liber II. De rerum humanarum natura et statu, Zweite Rezension, Zweiter Halbband*. PTS 77. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Declerck, José and Tobias Thum. 2019. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos VIII/8, Sacra, Liber II. De rerum*

humanarum natura et statu, Supplementa, Appendices, Indices. PTS 78. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Thum, Tobias. 2018. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos VIII/5, Sacra, Liber II. De rerum humanarum natura et statu. Erste Rezension. Zweiter Halbband.* PTS 75. Berlin: De Gruyter.

John Malalas

Chron. *Chronographia*

Thurn, Johannes. 2000. *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 35. Berlin: De Gruyter.

John of Nikiu

Chronicle

Charles, R. H. 1916. *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*. London: Williams & Norgate.

John Philoponus

de Aet. *De Aeternitate Mundi*

Rabe, H. 1984. *Ioannes Philoponus: De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Share, Michael. 2005. *John Philoponus: Against Proclus' "On the eternity of the world" 1–5*. Ancient commentators on Aristotle. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Julius Africanus

Chron. *Chronicon*

Wallraff, Martin. 2012. *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*. TU 157. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ps-Justin Martyr

Coh. Gr. *Cohortatio ad Graecos*

Pouderon, Bernard. 2009. *Pseudo-Justin: Ouvrages apologétiques*. SC 528. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Libanius

Or. *Orationes*

Norman, A. F. 1969. *Libanius: Selected Orations*. Volume 1. LCL 451. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Macarius Magnes

Apocr. *Apocriticus*

Schott, Jeremy M. and Mark J. Edwards. 2015. *Macarius: Apocriticus*. TTH 62. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Menander

Epit. *Epitrepontes*

Kock, T. 1888. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. Volume III. Leipzig: Teubner.

Sandbach, F. H. 1990. *Menandri Reliquiae selectae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michael Glycas

Ann. *Annales*

Bekker, Immanuel. 1836. *Michaelis Glycae Annales*. Bonn: Weber.

Moses bar Kepha

Masius, Andreas. 1569. *Moses Bar Kepha: De paradiso commentaries*. Antwerp: Christopher Plantin.

Numenius

des Places, Édouard. 1974. *Numénius: Fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Origen

Comm. in I Cor. *Commentaria in I Corinthianos*

Jenkins, Claude. 1908. "Origen on I Corinthians. IV." *JThS* 10: 29–51.

Orphica

OF *Orphicorum Fragmenta*

Bernabé, A. 2004–07. *Orphicorum et orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta*. Poetae epici Graeci testimonia et fragmenta, Pars II, fasc. 1–3. Munich; Leipzig: Teubner.

Philo of Alexandria

Colson, F. H. 1985. *Philo in Ten* Volumes. Volume IX. LCL 363. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Philostratus

VA *Vita Apollonii*

Jones, Christopher P. 2006. *Philostratus: Apollonius of Tyana III*. LCL 458. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Phrynicus

De Borries, Ioannes. 1911. *Phrynichi sophistae Praeparatio sophistica*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Plotinus

Enneads Gerson, Lloyd, et. al. 2018. *Plotinus: The Enneads*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Porphyry

Abst. *De Abstinentia*

Clark, Gillian. 2000. *Porphyry of Tyre: On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Antr. *De Antro Nympharum*

Dorandi, Tiziano. 2019. *Porphyre: L'Antre des nymphes dans l'*Odyssée. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Chr. *contra Christianos*

Becker, Matthias. 2016. *Porphyrios, Contra Christianos: Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Harnack, Adolf von. 1916. *Porphyrios, "Gegen die Christen," 15 Bücher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate*. Abhandlungen der königlichen preussischen Akademie

der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 1. Berlin: Verlag der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Comm. Tim. — *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*

Sodano, A. R. 1964. *Porfirio: Porphyrii In Platonis Timaeum commentariorum fragmenta*. Naples: [unknown].

Ep. Aneb. — *Epistle to Anebo*

Saffrey, Henri Dominique and Alain-Philippe Segonds. 2012. *Porphyre: Lettre à Anébon l'Égyptien*. Collection des universités de France. Série grecque 492. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Sodano, A. R. 1958. *Porfirio, Lettera ad Anebo, Lettera ad Anebo*. Naples: L'Arte Tipographica.

Fr. — *Fragmenta*

Smith, Andrew. 1993. *Porphyrius: Fragmenta*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Marc. — *Epistle to Marcella*

des Places, Édouard and A-Ph. Segonds. 2019. *Porphyre: Vie de Pythagore. Lettre à Marcella.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Sent. — *Sententiae*

Brisson, Luc. 2005. *Porphyre. Sentences*. Volume 1. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Procopius of Gaza

Gen. — *Commentaria in Genesim*

Metzler, K. 2015. *Prokop von Gaza: Eclogarum in libros historicos Veteris Testamenti epitome, Teil 1: Der Genesiskommentar*. GCS 22. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ps-Pythagoras

Fr.inc. — *Fragmenta Incerta*

Thesleff, Holger. 1965. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Finland: Åbo Akademi.

Severus of Antioch

Letter to Caesaria — Brooks, E. W. 1920. *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch*. Patrologia Orientalis 14. Paris: Firmin-Didot.

Philal. *Philalethes*

Hespel, Robert. 1952. *Sévère d'Antioche: Le Philalèthe*. CSCO 133, Scriptores Syri 68. Louvain: L. Durbecq.

Severus ibn al-Muqaffa'

Hist.Patriarch. *Historia Patriarcharum*

Evetts, B. 1907. *Severus (Ibn al-Muqaffa') of Al'Ashmunein: History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria. Part 2: Peter I – Benjamin I (661 AD).* Patrologia Orientalis 1. Paris: Fermin-Didot.

Sibylline Oracles

Geffcken, Johannes. 1902. *Oracula Sibyllina*. GCS 8. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Sopater

Schol. ad Hermog. *Scholia ad Hermogenem*

Walz, Christian. 1968. *Rhetores Graeci*. Volume v. Stuttgart; Tübingen: J. G. Cotta.

Syrianus

in Metaph. *In Metaphysica Commentaria*

Kroll, W. 1902. *Syrianus: In Metaphysica Commentaria*. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, Volume vi, Part I. Berlin: Reimer.

Theodore of Mopsuestia

c. Iul. *contra Iulianum*

Guida, Augusto. 1994. *Teodoro di Mopsuestia: Replica a Giuliano Imperatore*. Florence: Nardini Editore.

Theodoret

Affect. *Affectionum Graecarum Curatio*

Canivet, Pierre. 1958. *Thérapeutique des maladies Helléniques*. Two volumes. SC 57.1 and 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Ep. *Epistulae*

Azéma, Y. 1976. *Théodoret de Cyr: Correspondance*. Volume II. SC 98. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Tragedian (anonymous)

TrGF Adespota *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*

Nauck, Augustus. 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Xenophanes

Fr. *Fragmenta*

Laks, André and Glenn W. Most. 2016. *Early Greek Philosophy*. Volume III. LCL 526. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.

Zacharias of Mytilene (Zacharias Scholasticus)

Life of Severus Ambjörn, Lena. 2008. *The Life of Severus by Zachariah of Mytilene*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

Krugener, M.-A. 1907. *Vie de Sévère, par Zacharie le Scholastique*. Patrologia Orientalis 2. Paris: Firmin-Didot.

Secondary Sources

Ahbel-Rappe, Sara. 2010. *Damascius' Problems and Solutions concerning First Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arcari, Luca, ed. 2017. *Beyond Conflicts: Cultural and Religious Cohabitations in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st and the 6th Century* CE. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia. 1992. *Julian: An Intellectual Biography*. London: Routledge.

1993. "Dreams, Theurgy and Freelance Divination: The Testimony of Iamblichus." *JRS* 83: 115–30.

2009. "Le traitement du mythe: De l'empereur Julien à Proclus." In *Pensée grecque et sagesse d'Orient: Hommage à Michel Tardieu*, edited by M.-A. Amir-Moezzi, J.-D. Dubois, C. Jullien, and F. Jullien, 63–76. Turnhout: Brepols.

Ayres, Lewis. 2004. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldwin, B. 1975. "The Career of Oribasius." *AClass* 18: 85–97.

Bartelink, Gerard J. M. 1983. "Homer in den Werken des Kyrillos von Alexandrien." *WS* NF 17 [96]: 62–68.

Beers, Walter F. 2020. "Bloody Iuvenalia: Hypatia, Pulcheria Augusta, and the Beginnings of Cyril of Alexandria's Episcopate." In *Hypatia of Alexandria*, edited by Dawn LaValle Norman and Alex Petkas, 67–86. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 119. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bidez, Joseph. 1913. *Vie de Porphyre*. Gand: Van Goethem.

Blank, David. 2010. "Ammonius Hermeiou and His School." In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Volume 11, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, 654–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blummel, Lincoln H. 2014. "Luke 22:43–44: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation or an Apologetic Omission?" *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 19: 1–35.

Borst, Arno. 1957–63. *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. Four volumes. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann Verlag.

Boswell, Brad. 2021. "Goats, Gods, and the Mystery of Christ: Exegesis and Narrative Conflict between Julian and Cyril." *Studia Patristica* 129: 51–67.

2022. "Moses the Hellenic Sage: Re-reading Julian's *Against the Galileans*." *JECS* 30: 245–74.

Forthcoming. *Emperor Julian, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Narrative Conflict of Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bouffartigue, Jean. 1992. *L'empereur Julien et la culture de son temps*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 133. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.

2005. "La diversité des nations et la nature des hommes: L'empereur Julien et Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans une controverse incertaine." In *Dieu(x) et hommes: Histoire et iconographie des sociétés païennes et chrétiennes de l'antiquité à nos jours. Mélanges en l'honneur de Françoise Thelamon*, edited by S. Crogiez-Pétrequin, 113–26. Rouen: Université de Rouen.

2011. "Porphyre et Julien contre les chrétiens: Intentions, motifs et méthodes de leurs écrits." In *Le traité de Porphyre contre les chrétiens: Un siècle de recherches, nouvelles questions: Actes du colloque international organisé les 8 et 9 septembre 2009 à l'Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne*, edited by S. Morlet, 407–26. Série Antiquité 190. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.

Bouffartigue, Jean and Michel Patillon, eds. 1977. *Porphyry: De l'abstinence. Livre 1, Vol. 1*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Boulnois, Marie-Odile. 1994. *Le paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 143. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.

1997. "Platon entre Moïse et Arius selon le *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Studia Patristica* 32: 264–71.

2003. "The Mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria: The Deployment of the Triad and Its Recapitulation into the Unity of Diversity." In *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*,

edited by Thomas G. Weinandy and Daniel A. Keating, 75–111. London: T. & T. Clark.

2006. "Le Dieu suprême peut-il entrer en contact avec le monde? Un débat entre païens et chrétiens sur la transcendance divine à partir du *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie." In *La transcendance dans la philosophie grecque tardive et dans la pensée chrétienne (Actes du VIe congrès de philosophie grecque, Athènes 22–26 sept 2004)*, edited by E. Moutsopoulos and G. Lekkas, 177–96. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

2008a. "Genèse 2–3: Mythe ou vérité? Un sujet de polémique entre païens et chrétiens dans le *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *RÉAug* 54: 111–33.

2008b. "L'élection d'Israël et la grâce offerte à tous: L'exégèse de Romains 9–11 selon Cyrille d'Alexandrie." *Adamantius* 14: 266–85.

2008c. "Dieu peut-il être envieux ou jaloux? Un débat sur les attributs divins entre l'empereur Julien et Cyrille d'Alexandrie." In *Culture classique et christianisme. Mélanges offerts à Jean Bouffartigue*, edited by D. Auger and É. Wolff, 13–25. Paris: Picard.

2011a. "1. Cyrille d'Alexandrie, *Contre Julien* IV, 29–48: L'épisode de Babel et l'origine de la diversité des nations." *AEPHE V* 118: 157–61.

2011b. "La diversité des nations et l'élection d'Israël: Y a-t-il une influence du *Contre Celse* d'Origène sur le *Contre les Galiléens* de Julien?" In *Origeniana decima: Origen as Writer: Papers of the 10th International Origen Congress*, edited by Sylwia Kaczmarek, Henryk Pietras, and Andrzej Dziadowiec, 803–30. Leuven: Peeters.

2011c. "Un dieu jaloux qui fait des émules: Interprétations patristiques d'Ex 20,5, Nb 25,11 et Dt 32,21." In *Jalousie des dieux, jalousie des hommes: Actes du colloque international organizé à Paris les 28 at 29 novembre 2008*, edited by H. Rouillard-Bonraisin, 249–76. Turnhout: Brepols.

2014. "'Le *Contre les Galiléens* de l'empereur Julien répond-il au *Contre Celse* d'Origène?'" In *ΕΝ ΚΑΛΟΙΣ ΚΟΙΝΟΠΡΑΓΙΑ: Hommages à la mémoire de Pierre-Louis Malosse et Jean Bouffartigue*, edited by Eugenio Amato, 103–28. Revue des Études Tardo-antiques, Supplément 3. Nantes: Association Textes pour l'histoire de l'Antiquité tardive.

2017. "Païens et chrétiens en concurrence: l'instrumentalisation de la philosophie dans les controverses d'Origène contre Celse et de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Julien." In *Philosophia in der Konkurrenz von Schulen, Wissenschaften und Religionen: Zur Pluralisierung des Philosophiebegriffs in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike*, edited by Christoph Riedweg, 217–55. Berlin: De Gruyter.

2020a. "Cyril of Alexandria Reading Porphyry." *JECS* 28: 443–65.

2020b. "Le livre VIII du *Contre Julien* de Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Éléments pour la datation, le plan et la méthode de réfutation." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 165–94. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

2020c. "Le prologue de l'évangile de Jean au coeur de la polémique entre l'empereur Julien et Cyrille d'Alexandrie." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4.*

und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum," edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 195–227. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

2020d. "Le rôle de l'exégèse pour la formation du dogme chrétien dans la polémique antijuive: Le cas de la théophanie de Mambré (Gn 18)." In *Exégèse, revelation et formation des dogmes dans l'antiquité tardive*, edited by Luciana Gabriela Soares Santoprete, Alain Le Boulluec, and Andrei Timotin, 241–67. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.

2021. "The Biblical Text and Its Variants at the Heart of the Debate between the Emperor Julian and Cyril of Alexandria: The Cases of Genesis 6,2 and 49,10." *ZAC* 25: 284–319.

Bowersock, G. 1978. *Julian the Apostate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boys-Stones, George. 2018. *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bradbury, Scott. 2020. "Julian and the Jews." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 267–92. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Bregman, Jay. 1982. *Synesius of Cyrene: Philosopher-Bishop*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 2. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brisson, L. 1987. "Amélius, son œuvre, sa doctrine, son style." *ANRW* 2, 36.2: 793–860.

2013. "Clement and Cyril of Alexandria: Confronting Platonism with Christianity." *St. Patr*. 58, 6: 19–44.

Brüggemann, Thomas. 2020. "Ἀποστροφή in *Contra Iulianum*: Julian als fiktives Gegenüber Kyrills." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 153–64. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Cameron, Alan and Jacqueline Long. 1993. *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cameron, Averil. 2014. *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University.

Cameron, Averil and Niels Gaul, eds. 2017. *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*. New York: Routledge.

Champion, Michael W. 2014. *Explaining the Cosmos: Creation and Cultural Interaction in Late-Antique Gaza*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chantraine, P. 1954. "Le divin et les dieux chez Homère." In *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon*, 47–79. Vandoeuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Chronz, M. and Wolfram Kinzig. 2004. "Beobachtungen zur Bucheinteilung und zum ursprünglichen Umfang von Kyrills *Contra Iulianum* sowie Julians *Contra Galilaeos*." In *"… zur Zeit oder Unzeit" Studien zur spätantiken Theologie-, Geistes- und Kunstgeschichte und ihrer Nachwirkung*, edited by A. M. Ritter, W. Wischmeyer, and Wolfram Kinzig, 29–62. Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero.

Clark, Gillian. 2000a. "Philosophic Lives and the Philosophic Life: Porphyry and Iamblichus." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, edited by Tomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 29–51. Berkeley: University of California Press.

2000b. *Porphyry of Tyre: On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Coleman, Kathleen. 1990. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *JRS* 80: 44–73.

Collette, Bernard. 2021. *The Stoic Doctrine of Providence: A Study of Its Development and of Some of Its Major Issues*. London: Routledge.

Cook, John Granger. 2000. *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2004. *The Interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 23. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2016. "Julian and Porphyry on the Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospels." *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 10: 193–207.

Copenhaver, Brian. 1992. *Hermetica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, Matthew R. 2013. "Scripture as 'One Book': Origen, Jerome, and Cyril of Alexandria on Isaiah 29:11." *JThS* 64: 137–53.

2014. *Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2020a. "Reconsidering the Relationship between (Pseudo-)Didymus's *De Trinitate* and Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Julianum*." *JThS* 71: 236–57.

2020b. "The Influence of Eusebius' *Chronicle* on the Apologetic Treatises of Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine of Hippo." *JEH* 71: 693–711.

2020c. "Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Iulianum*, Imperial Politics, and Alexandrian Philosophy (c. 416–428)." In *Eastern Christianity and Late Antique Philosophy*, edited by Eva Anagnostou-Laoutides and Ken Parry, 110–32. Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 18. Leiden: Brill.

2023a. "Towards a New Edition of Julian's *Contra Galilaeos*: Assessing the Material from the Syriac Transmission of Cyril's *Contra Iulianum*." *Classical Quarterly* 72: 850–67.

2023b. "Cyril of Alexandria's Renunciation of Religious Violence." *Church History* 92: 1–21.

2024. "The Emperor Julian and Cyril of Alexandria on Human Nature, Ethnicity, and Moral Progress." *ETL* 100: 73–102.

2025. "Defending the Glory of God: Cyril of Alexandria's Political Theology at the Court of Theodosius II." In *Christian Political Cultures in Late Antiquity*, edited by Richard Flower, Meaghan McEvoy, and Robin Whelan. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Forthcoming. "The Value of Human Life: Christology and Human Flourishing according to Cyril of Alexandria." In *Creation, Christology, and Human Flourishing*, edited by Michael W. Champion and Matthew R. Crawford. Berlin: De Gruyter.

De Labriolle, Pierre. 1934. *La réaction païenne: Étude sur la polémique antichrétienne du I^er^ au VI^e^ siècle*. Paris: L'Artisan du Livre.

De Vita, Maria Carmen. 2020. "*Callidior ceteris persecutor* (Rufin. *hist*. 10,33): Giuliano e la questione Ariana." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 39–63. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dijkstra, Jitse and Christian R. Raschle, eds. 2020. *Religious Violence in the Ancient World: From Classical Athens to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dillon, John. 2009. "St. John in Amelius' Seminar." In *Late Antique Epistemology: Other Ways to Truth*, edited by Panayiota Vassilopoulou and Stephen R. L. Clark, 30–43. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dillon, J., D. Russell, and S. Gertz, trans. 2012. *Aeneas of Gaza, Theophrastus*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Dörrie, H. 1972. "Une exégèse neoplatonicienne du prologue de l'Évangile selon saint Jean." In *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au cardinal Jean Daniélou*, edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengieser, 75–87. Paris: Beauchesne.

Dragona-Monachou, Myrto. 1994. "Divine Providence in the Philosophy of the Empire." In *ANRW* 2, 36.7: 4417–90.

Drijvers, Jan Willem. 1992. *Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the True Cross*. Leiden: Brill.

Droge, Arthur J. 1989. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.

Edwards, Mark. 2006. *Culture and Philosophy in the Age of Plotinus*. London: Duckworth.

2015. *Religions of the Constantinian Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2019. *Aristotle and Early Christian Thought*. London: Routledge.

Elderkin, G. W. 1941. "The Akanthos Column at Delphi." *Hesperia* 10: 373–80.

Elm, Susanna. 2012. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 49. Berkeley: University of California Press.

2017. "The Old Man from Tyre: Julian's *Contra Galilaeos* and the Fourth-Century Nachleben of Porphyry's Engagement with Christians." In *Die Christen als Bedrohung? Text, Kontext und Wirkung von Porphyrios' Contra Christianos*, edited by Irmgard Männlein-Robert, 307–23. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Eubank, Nathan. 2010. "A Disconcerting Prayer: On the Originality of Luke 23:34a." *JBL* 129: 521–36.

Fairbairn, Donald. 2003. *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finamore, John F. 1988. "ΘΕΟΙ ΘΕΩΝ: An Iamblichean Doctrine in Julian's *Against the Galilaeans*." *TAPhA* 118: 393–401.

Finamore, John F. and Sarah Iles Johnston. 2010. "The *Chaldaean Oracles*." In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Volume 1, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, 161–73. Cambridge University Press.

Finkelstein, Ari. 2018. *The Specter of the Jews: Emperor Julian and the Rhetoric of Ethnicity in Syrian Antioch*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Fowden, Garth. 1986. *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fredericksmeyer, Ernest. 1979. "Divine Honors for Philip II." *TAPhA* 109: 39–61.

Früchtel, L. 1937. "Neue Textzeugnisse zu Clemens Alexandrinus." *ZNTW* 36, 1: 81–90.

Gaddis, M. 2005. *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goldhill, Simon, ed. 2008. *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goulet, Richard. 2000. "Horapollon." In *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Volume III, 804–06.

2003. *Macarios de Magnésie: Le Monogénès. Tome I: Introduction générale*. Paris: Vrin.

2004. "Hypothèses récentes sur le traité de Porphyre Contre les chrétiens." In *Hellénisme et Christianisme*, edited by Michel Narcy and Éric Rebillard, 61–109. Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

2005. "Le titre de l'ouvrage." In *Porphyre. Sentences*, Volume 1, edited by Luc Brisson, 11–16. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.

Grant, Robert M. 1964. "Greek Literature in the Treatise *De Trinitate* and Cyril *Contra Julianum*." *JThS* 15: 265–79.

Greatrex, Geoffrey. 2018. "Zacharias Rhetor of Mytilene." *Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, Volume II, edited by Oliver Nicholson, 1605–07. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenwood, David Neal. 2021. *Julian and Christianity: Revisiting the Constantinian Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Greer, Rowan and Margaret Mitchell, eds. 2007. *The "Belly-Myther" of Endor: Interpretations of I Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Griffith, Sydney. 1987. "Ephrem the Syrian's Hymns 'Against Julian': Meditations on History and Imperial Power." *Vig.Christ.* 41: 238–66.

Griffiths, J. G. 1948. "Human Sacrifices in Egypt: The Classical Evidence." *ASAE* 48: 409–23.

Guida, Augusto. 1996. "Altre testimonianze e un nuovo frammento del 'Contro i Galilei' di Giuliano Imperatore." In *Hodoi dizēsios: Le vie della ricerca: Studi in onore di Francesco Adorno*, edited by M. Serena Funghi, 241–52. Florence: L. S. Olschki.

2020. "La trasmissione del testo del *Contra Galilaeos* di Giuliano e un nuovo misterioso frammento." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 91–109. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Guinot, Jean-Noël. 1988. "L'exégèse du bouc émissaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Théodoret de Cyr." *Augustinianum* 28: 603–30.
Haas, Christopher. 1997. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Hahn, Johannes. 2004. *Gewalt und religiöser Konflikt: Studien zu den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Christen, Heiden und Juden im Osten des Römischen Reiches (von Konstantin bis Theodosius II)*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
Hammerstaedt, J. 1996. "Die Vergöttlichung unwürdiger Menschen bei den Heiden als apologetisches Argument in Schriften des Sokrates, Theodoret, Cyrill von Alexandrien und Johannes Chrysostomos." *JbAC* 39: 76–101.
Hanson, R. P. C. 1988. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
Hardy, E. R. 1982. "The Further Education of Cyril of Alexandria (412–444): Questions and Problems." *Studia Patristica* 17, 1: 116–22.
Harries, Jill. 2012. "Julian the Lawgiver." In *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, edited by Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher, 121–36. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. 2006. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 42. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Heubeck, A., S. West, and J. G. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. Three volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hintze, F. and S. Morenz. 1954. "Ein Streitgespräch Kyrills." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 79: 125–40.
d'Hoine, Pieter and Marije Martijn. 2017. *All from One: A Guide to Proclus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hoffman, Philippe. 1994. "Damascius." *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Volume 11, 541–93.
Hombert, Pierre-Marie. 2023. "Le *De Trinitate* attribué à Didyme d'Alexandrie: Un nouveau *status quaestionis*." *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 69: 3–84.
Van der Horst, Pieter W. 1993. "'Thou Shalt Not Revile the Gods': The LXX Translation of Exodus 22:28 (27), Its Background and Influence." *Studia Philonica* 5: 1–8.
Huber-Rebenich, Gerlinde and Stefan Rebenich, eds. 2020. *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum."* TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Huffman, Carl. 2012. "Aristoxenus' *Life of Socrates*." In *Aristoxenus of Tarentum*, edited by Carl Huffman, 251–82. New Brunswick: Transaction.
Hunt, David. 2012. "The Christian Context of Julian's *Against the Galileans*." In *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, edited by Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher, 251–61. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
Johnson, Aaron P. 2006a. *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius'* Praeparatio Evangelica. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2006b. "Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* as Literary Experiment." In *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*, edited by Scott F. Johnson, 67–89. Aldershot: Ashgate.

2010. "Rethinking the Authenticity of Porphyry, contra Christianos, fr. 1." *Studia Patristica* 46: 53–58.

2012a. "Hellenism and Its Discontents." In *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, edited by Scott F. Johnson, 437–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2012b. "Philosophy, Hellenicity, Law: Porphyry on Origen, Again." *JHS* 132: 55–69.

2013. *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: The Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2015. "Astrology and the Will in Porphyry of Tyre." In *Causation and Creation in Classical and Late Antiquity*, 186–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2017. "Early Christianity and the Classical Tradition." In *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson, 625–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2019. "The Fifth-Century Transformation of Apologetics in Cyril and Theodoret." In *The Fifth Century: Age of Transformation*, edited by Jan Willem Drijvers and Noel Lenski, 247–59. Munera: Studi storici sulla Tarda Antichità 46. Bari: Edipuglia.

2020. "Words at War: Textual Violence in Eusebius." In *The Violence of Small Worlds: Conflict and Social Control in Late Antiquity*, edited by Kate Cooper and Jamie Wood, 213–31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2021. "Philosophy in Eusebius and Marcellus." In *The Routledge Handbook of Early Christian Philosophy*, edited by Mark Edwards, 450–60. New York: Routledge.

Forthcoming. "Cyril of Alexandria as a Reader of Plato." In *Platonic Principles: Studies in Honor of Lloyd Gerson*, edited by Frederick Lauritzen and Sarah Klitenic Wear. Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press.

Jones, A. H. M., J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris. 1971. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Three volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaldellis, Anthony. 2005. "Julian, the Hierophant of Eleusis, and the Abolition of Constantius' Tyranny." *CQ* 55: 652–55.

Kaufhold, Hubert. 2020. "Werke des Kyrill in syrischer Überlieferung." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 229–55. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kinzig, Wolfram. 2020. "Structure and *Sitz im Leben* of Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Iulianum*." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 111–29. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kinzig, Wolfram and Thomas Brüggemann. 2006. "Towards a Better Understanding of Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*: The Manuscripts Used by Jean Aubert in His Edition of 1638." *Studia Patristica* 40: 267–74.
Koch, J. 1893. *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*. Leipzig: Teubner.
LaValle Norman, Dawn and Alex Petkas, eds. 2020. *Hypatia of Alexandria: Her Context and Legacy*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 119. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Lenski, N. 2002. *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century AD*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Levenson, David B. 2004. "The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple." *JSJ* 35: 409–60.
Liébaert, Jacques. 1951. *La doctrine christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne*. Lille: Facultés Catholiques.
Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 2012. "Julian's *Hymn to the Mother of the Gods*: The Revival and Justification of Traditional Religion." In *Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, edited by Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher, 213–27. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
Long, A. A. 1988. "Socrates in Hellenistic Philosophy." *CQ* 38: 150–71.
Magree, Michael C. 2024. *The Interpretation of Kenosis from Origen to Cyril of Alexandria: Dimensions of Self-Emptying in the Reception of Philippians 2:7*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Malley, William J. 1978. *Hellenism and Christianity: The Conflict between Hellenic and Christian Wisdom in the "Contra Galilaeos" of Julian the Apostate and the "Contra Julianum" of St. Cyril of Alexandria*. Analecta Gregoriana 210. Rome: Università Gregoriana.
Männlein-Robert, I. 2013. "Tugend, Flucht und Ekstase: Zur ὁμοίωσις θεῷ in der Kaiserzeit und Spätantike." In *Ethik des antiken Platonismus: Der platonische Weg zum Glück in Systematik, Entstehung und historischem Kontext*, edited by Ch. Pietsch, 99–111. Stuttgart: Steiner.
Marcone, Arnaldo. 2019. "Il *Contro i Galilei* di Giuliano edito da Voltaire. Storia – e paradossi – di un pamphlet di polemica religiosa." In *PHILOBIBLOS: Scritti in onore di Giovanni Geraci*, edited by A. Bencivenni et al., 545–66. Milan: Jouvence.
2020. "Pagan Reactions to Julian." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 326–59. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.
Mason, Hugh. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*. American Studies in Papyrology 13. Toronto: Hakkert.
McKenzie, Judith. 2007. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt c. 300 BC to AD 700*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Meijering, E. P. 1975. "Cyril of Alexandria on the Platonists and the Trinity." In *God, Being, History: Studies in Patristic Philosophy*, 114–27. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
Millar, Fergus. 2006. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408–450)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mitchell, Margaret M. 2022. "'Snacking on Greek Learning': Julian and Cyril in Scriptural σύγκρισις." Paper delivered at the North American Patristics Society annual meeting.

Morlet, S. 2008. "Un nouveau témoignage sur le *Contra Christianos* de Porphyre?" *Semitica et Classica* 1: 149–58.

2009. *La Démonstration Évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée: Étude sur l'apologétique chrétienne à l'époque de Constantin*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.

2011a. "Pourquoi Dieu a-t-il interdit la connaissance du bien et du mal? La critique porphyrienne de Gn 2, 17: Le problème de ses sources et de sa postérité." *Semitica et Classica* 4: 125–46.

2011b. "Eusebius' Polemic against Porphyry: A Reassessment." In *Reconsidering Eusebius*, edited by Sabrina Inowlocki and Claudio Zamagni, 119–50. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 107. Leiden: Brill.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther. 2001. "Kaiserlicher Held und Christenfeind: Julian Apostata im Urteil des späteren 4. und des 5. Jh.s n. Chr." In *Die Welt des Sokrates von Konstantinopel*, edited by B. Bäbler and H.-G. Nesselrath, 15–43. Munich; Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

2020a. "Julian's Philosophical Writings." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 38–63. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

2020b. "Von götterlosen Galiläern und grotesken Gräberkulten." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 1–14. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Niccolai, Lea. 2023. *Christianity, Philosophy, and Roman Power: Constantine, Julian, and the Bishops on Exegesis and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noethlichs, K. L. 1986. "Heidenverfolgung." *RAC* 13: 1149–90.

Nünlist, René. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2018. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton Classics. Princeton Oxford: Princeton University Press.

O'Meara, D. 2003. *Platonopolis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paget, James Carleton and Simon Gathercole, eds. 2021. *Celsus in His World: Philosophy, Polemic and Religion in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Papadogiannakis, Yannis. 2012. *Christianity and Hellenism in the Fifth-Century Greek East: Theodoret's Apologetics against the Greeks in Context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perrone, L. 1994. "Echi della polemica pagana sulla Bibbia negli scritti esegetici fra IV e V secolo: Le 'Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti' dell' Ambrosiaster." *AnnSE* 11: 161–85.

Pietsch, Thomas. 2023. "St Cyril of Alexandria and the Mysteries of Isis in *De Adoratione*." *JEH* 74: 703–19.

Pilhofer, Peter. 1990. *Presbyteron kreitton: Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte*. WUNT 39. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.

Rebenich, Stefan. 2020. "Julian's Afterlife: The Reception of a Roman Emperor." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 398–420. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

2021. "'History in Cyril': Das historische Argument in der Schrift *Contra Iulianum* des Patriarchen Kyrill von Alexandrien." In *Ecclesia victrix? Zum Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in der Spätantike: Festschrift für Klaus Martin Girardet*, edited by Karen Aydin, Christine van Hoof, and Lukas Mathieu, 169–85. Berlin: LIT.

Riedweg, Christoph. 1994. *Ps-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?), Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher "Cohortatio ad Graecos"): Einleitung und Kommentar*. 2 vols. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 25. Basel: F. Reinhardt.

1999. "With Stoicism and Platonism against the Christians: Structures of Philosophical Argumentation in Julian's *Contra Galilaeos*." *Hermathena* 166: 63–91.

2000. "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Apologie Kyrills von Alexandrien *Contra Iulianum*." *Museum Helveticum* 57: 151–65.

2005. "Mythos mit geheimem Sinn oder reine Blasphemie? Julian über die mosaische Erzählung vom Sündenfall (*Contra Galilaeos* fr. 17,10–12 Masaracchia)." In *κορυφαίῳ ἀνδρί: Mélanges offerts à André Hurst*, edited by A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich, and A.-L. Rey, 367–75. Recherches et rencontres 22. Geneva: Librairie Droz.

2008a. "Das Verbot, vom Baum der Erkenntnis von Gut und Böse zu essen (Gen 2, 17): Zeichen eines missgünstigen Gottes? Kaiser Julian und Kyrill von Alexandrien in einer virtuellen Debatte." In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*, edited by K. Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 187–208. Tübingen: Mohr.

2008b. "Julians Exegese der Rede des Demiurgen an die versammelten Götter in Platons *Timaios* 41a–d." In *Culture classique et christianisme: Mélanges offerts à Jean Bouffartigue*, edited by Danièle Auger and Étienne Wolff, 83–95. Paris: Picard.

2011. "Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De Prouidentia*: Greek Fragments and Arabic Versions." In *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, edited by Dirk Obbink and Richard Rutherford, 277–301. New York: Oxford University Press.

2012. "Exegese als Kampfmittel in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Heiden und Christen: Zum 'Sündenbock' von Lev 16 bei Julian und Kyrill von Alexandrien." *ZAC* 16, 3: 439–76.

2020a. "A German Renaissance Humanist as Predecessors and Some Further Surprises." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 257–85. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

2020b. "Anti-Christian Polemics and Pagan Onto-Theology: Julian's *Against the Galilaeans*." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 244–66. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Riedweg, Christoph and Christian Oesterheld. 1998. "Scritto e controscritto: Per una nuova edizione di Cirillo Alessandrino Contra Iulianum." In *Giuliano Imperatore: Le sue idee, i suoi amici, i suoi avversari*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Lecce, 10–12 Dicembre 1998. *Rudiae (Ricerche sul mondo classico)* 10: 415–33.

Rigolio, Alberto. 2019. *Christians in Conversation: A Guide to Late Antique Dialogues in Greek and Syriac*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ritter, Adolf Martin. 2020. "Theologische Kontroversen innerhalb der römischen Reichskirche und ihre Widerspiegelung in der Christenpolemik Kaiser Julians." In *Interreligiöse Konflikte im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert: Julian "Contra Galilaeos" – Kyrill "Contra Iulianum,"* edited by Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich and Stefan Rebenich, 15–38. TU 181. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rives, J. 1994. "Tertullian on Child Sacrifice." *MH* 51: 54–63.

Runia, David T. 1997. "The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria." In *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition: Essays Presented to John Whittaker*, edited by M. Joyal, 261–92. Aldershot: Ashgate.

2023. "The Aëtian *Placita* and the Church Fathers: Creative Use of a Distinctive Mode of Ordering Knowledge." In *The Intellectual World of Late Antique Christianity: Reshaping Classical Traditions*, edited by Lewis Ayres, Michael Champion, and Matthew R. Crawford, 198–220. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, Norman. 2000. *Cyril of Alexandria*. The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge.

2007. "The Church in the Commentaries of St. Cyril of Alexandria." *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 7: 70–85.

Sandwell, Isabella. 2005. "Outlawing 'Magic' or Outlawing 'Religion'? Libanius and the Theodosian Code as Evidence for Legislation against 'Pagan' Practices." In *The Spread of Christianity in the First Four Centuries*, edited by W. V. Harris, 87–123. Leiden: Brill.

Schibli, Hermann S. 2002. *Hierocles of Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt-Hofner, Sebastian. 2020. "Reform, Routine, and Propaganda: Julian the Lawgiver." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 124–71. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Schrader, Hermann. 1888. "Zu den Fragmenten des Φιλόσοφος Ἱστορία des Porphyrios bei Cyrill von Alexandria." *AGPh* 1, 3: 359–74.

Schramm, Michael. 2017. "Platonikerzitate in Kyrill von Alexandrias *Contra Iulianum*." *Mus.Helv*. 74: 66–85.

Sferlea, Gheorghe Ovidiu. 2016. "Le titre Theotokos dans les débats christologiques du IVe siècle." *Laval théologique et philosophique* 72: 491–511.

Siddals, Ruth M. 1987. "Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria." *JThS* 38: 341–67.
Smith, Rowland. 1995. *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate*. London: Routledge.
Speller, Lydia Agnew. 1983. "New Light on the Photinians: The Evidence of Ambrosiaster." *JThS* 34: 99–113.
Steel, Carlos. 2010. "Proclus." In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Volume 11, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, 630–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stöcklin-Kaldewey, Sara. 2014. *Kaiser Julians Gottesverehrung im Kontext der Spätantike*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Tanaseanu-Döbler, Ilinca. 2013. *Theurgy in Late Antiquity: The Invention of a Ritual Tradition*. Beiträge zur Europäischen Religionsgeschichte 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
Thraede, K. 1962. "Erfinder II." *RAC* 5: 1191–278.
1966. "Euhemerismus." *RAC* 6: 877–90.
Torres, Juana. 2009. "Emperor Julian and the Veneration of Relics." *AntTard* 17: 205–14.
Trombley, F. 2001. *Hellenic Religion and Christianization: C. 370–529*. Two volumes. Leiden: Brill.
Trovato, Stefano. 2012. "Un nuovo frammento e nuove testimonianze del 'Contra Galilaeos' di Giuliano l'Apostata." *JöByz* 62: 265–79.
Vaccari, A. 1937. "La grecità di S. Cirillo d'Alessandria." In *Studi dedicati alla memoria di P. Ubaldi*, edited by A. Gemelli, 27–39. Milan: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero."
van Loon, Hans. 2009. *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 96. Leiden: Brill.
Van Riel, Gerd. 2010. "Damascius." In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Volume 11, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, 667–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Villani, Barbara. 2022. "Creation of the Universe and Creation of Man in Cyril of Alexandria's Early Works on the Pentateuch." *ZAC* 26: 145–67.
Viltanioti, Irini-Fotini and Anna Marmodoro, eds. 2017. *Divine Powers in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vinzent, Markus. 2000. "'Oxbridge' in der ausgehenden Spätantike, oder: Ein Vergleich der Schulen von Athen und Alexandrien." *ZAC* 4: 49–82.
2001. "Halbe Heiden – Doppelte Christen: Die Festbriefe Kyrills von Alexandrien und die Datierung seines Werkes *Contra Iulianum*." In *Christen und Nichtchristen in Spätantike, Neuzeit und Gegenwart: Beginn und Ende des Konstantinischen Zeitalters*, edited by Angelika Dörfler-Dierken, Wolfram Kinzig, and Markus Vinzent, 41–60. Mandelbachtal: Edition Cicero.
Vössing, Konrad. 2020. "The Value of a Good Education: The School Law in Context." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 172–206. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Watts, Edwards J. 2006. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 41. Berkeley: University of California Press.

2010. *Riot in Alexandria: Tradition and Group Dynamics in Late Antique Pagan and Christian Communities*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 46. Berkeley: University of California Press.

2017. *Hypatia: The Life and Legend of an Ancient Philosopher*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Westerfeld, Jennifer Taylor. 2019. *Egyptian Hieroglyphs in the Late Antique Imagination*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich. 2020. "Revival and Reform: The Religious Policy of Julian." In *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, 207–44. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich and Stefan Rebenich, eds. 2020. *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill.

Wilken, Robert L. 1999. "Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Iulianum*." In *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R. A. Markus*, edited by William E. Klingshirn and Mark Vessey, 42–55. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Woodbury, L. 1973. "Socrates and the Daughter of Aristides." *Phoenix* 27: 7–25.

Zaganas, Dimitrios. 2019. *La formation d'une exégèse alexandrine post-origénienne: Les Commentaires sur les Douze Prophètes et sur Isaïe de Cyrille d'Alexandrie*. Traditio Exegetica Graeca 17. Leuven: Peeters.

Zeegers-Vander Vorst, N. 1972. *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e^ siècle*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain.

Indexes

Index references to the introduction to this volume are listed by page number of the print edition and are italicized. Index references to the translation are keyed to the book and section number of Cyril's text and are non-italicized.

Biblical Index

Old Testament
Genesis (Gen)

1 *38*, *40*
1:1 1.28, 2.26, 3.38
1:1–18 2.18
1:2 1.28, 2.27, 3.33, 3.36
1:3 1.28, 3.33, 4.40
1:4 3.33
1:6 2.27, 2.31, 3.33, 4.40
1:7 3.33
1:8 2.27
1:9 2.27, 2.31, 3.33, 4.40
1:11–12 2.28
1:14 3.33, 3.40
1:14–17 2.28
1:14–18 10.38
1:15 3.33, 3.40
1:16 3.33, 3.40
1:17 3.40
1:18 3.33
1:20 3.33
1:21 3.33
1:22 9.38
1:24–25 2.28
1:25 3.33
1:26 1.29, 1.30, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 2.28, 3.32, 4.44, 8.23, 9.4
1:26–28 2.32, 2.34
1:27 1.29, 9.5
1:28 3.5
1:31 4.27, 7.33, 9.38
2–3 3.33
2:4 3.38
2:5 3.38
2:7 3.6, 3.41
2:8 3.1
2:9 3.10, 3.15, 3.23, 3.26
2:15 3.1
2:16 3.10
2:16–17 3.5
2:17 3.23
2:18 3.1, 3.6
2:22 3.1
2:23 3.6
3:3 3.10, 3.15, 3.26, 8.35
3:4–5 3.26
3:19 10.12
3:21 9.28, 10.30
3:22 3.32
3:22–23 3.27
3:23 3.1
3:23–24 3.26
3:24 3.1
4:1 3.26
4:3–4 10.26
4:4 10.29
4:4–7 3.41, 10.26
4:7 10.22
4:23 9.12
4:26 1.19, 9.12
5:24 3.41
6 *16*, *46*, 9.2
6–8 1.6
6:1–2 9.11
6:2 9.2, 9.12
6:4 9.2, 9.11
6:6 3.39

6:9 9.12
6:12 3.51
7:11 3.42
8:2 3.42
8:4 1.6
8:21 3.41, 4.31
9:3 9.32, 9.34
9:3b 7.28
9:6 9.5
11:4 4.32
11:4–8 4.29
11:5–8 4.29
11:7 4.43, 8.23
11:28 10.34
11:31 10.34
12:1 1.10
12:10 6.37
14:1–2 1.23
14:9 1.23
14:17 1.23
14:19–20 1.23
14:21 1.23
14:22 1.23
15:1–6 10.37
15:5 *48*, 10.38
15:6 10.36
15:7–11 10.39
15:8 10.40
15:9 10.40
15:10–11 *48*
15:17 10.40
17:6 6.4
17:10–12 10.31
17:11–13 10.34
18:1–3 1.26
18:3 8.23
18:9–10 1.26
19:24 1.28, 8.23
22:6–7 10.25
22:13 10.25
22:16 5.15, 9.6
23:4 6.37
24 *48*, 10.37
24:1–61 10.41
24:3 1.23
28:5 6.37
28:13 1.27
28:20 1.27
29:18–20 6.37
30:43 6.4
32 9.10
32:11 6.37
32:24 9.10
32:29–30 9.10
32:31 9.10
35:1 9.10
49:10 *45*, 8.2, 8.12, 8.15, 8.16

Exodus (Exod)

1:7 6.4
1:12 6.4
2:22 6.37
3:14 1.30, 8.21
3:14–15 8.20
4:12 Dedic. 5
4:13 8.37
4:22 9.2
4:22–23 3.37
5:3 3.37
7:1 1.19
7:14–24 5.18
7:16 3.37
8:1–14 5.18
9:8–12 5.18
9:13–26 5.18
12:3 9.26
12:6 9.26
12:11 9.26, 10.25
12:14–15 9.39, 9.40
12:21–28 8.40
12:37 5.13
15:6 9.7
15:16 9.7
16:29 fr. 39
19:16 8.7
19:16–18 10.23
19:18 3.16
19:19 8.7
19:20 3.16
20:2 5.2
20:2–6 5.2
20:2–17 5.2
20:3 4.43, 5.2, 5.26, 8.4, 8.24
20:4 8.4
20:5 3.46, 3.54, 3.55, 5.6
20:12 5.3
20:13 5.3, 5.4
20:13–15 5.2
20:14 5.3
20:14–16 5.2
20:15 5.3, 5.4
20:16 5.4
20:17 5.4
22:19(20) 4.43, 9.13
22:27 7.31
22:27(28)a 7.28, 7.31
22:27(28)b 7.31
29:18 8.40, 9.20, 10.24
29:25 10.24
29:41 10.24
31:3 3.32, 3.49

32:1–6 5.16
32:4 9.25, 9.42
32:7–10 5.16
32:14 5.16
33:1–2 4.47
33:3 6.42
33:5 6.42
33:11 2.18
33:12 2.19
33:13 3.16
33:17 2.19
34:4–5 9.8
34:33 9.42

Leviticus (Lev)
2:1 10.28
5:7 10.28
6:8–13 10.23
7:10(20) 9.21
7:22–24 9.22
9:24 10.22, 10.23
10:1–2 10.23
11:1–7 9.33
11:1–8 9.32
11:9–11 9.33
11:13–19 9.33
11:29–30 9.33
14:21–22 10.28
16 *46*, 9.13, 9.18
16:5–8 9.14
16:10 9.14, 9.18
16:15–16 9.14, 9.20
16:20 9.18
17:3–4 9.46
18:22 9.20
20:10 9.20
20:13 9.20
20:27 9.20
23:9–11 10.28

Numbers (Num)
11:13 9.6
11:21 5.13
11:23 9.6
12:3 6.4
12:8 2.18
24:17 *45*, 8.2, 8.15, 8.17
25:1–3 5.18
25:1–5 6.2
25:3 5.13, 6.9
25:5 5.13, 5.26, 5.32, 6.9
25:7 5.19
25:11 5.13, 5.22, 5.28
25:11–13 5.19
36:5–8 8.14

Deuteronomy (Deut)
4:2 8.10, 9.39
4:9b 5.2
4:19 3.37, 3.40
4:24 5.6
4:28 6.12
4:35 8.15, 8.24
4:39 8.15, 8.24
5:6 5.2, 6.37
5:7 4.43, 5.2
5:8 8.4
5:9 3.54, 3.55, 5.6
5:16 5.3
5:17 5.3, 5.4
5:17–19 5.2
5:18 5.3, 5.4
5:19 5.3
5:20 5.4
5:21 5.4
6:4 8.5, 8.15, 8.22, 8.24
6:13 4.43, 5.26, 9.2, 9.9
7:3–4a 7.14
7:6 8.1
10:16 6.42
10:20 4.43, 5.26
12:1–3 7.31
12:29–31 4.18
13:1(2)–3(4) 10.18
13:6–10 9.20
14:2 8.1
14:3–8 9.32
14:21 8.1
17:2–7 9.20
18:10–11 9.20
18:11 6.20
18:15 *45*, 8.2
18:15–19 8.7, 8.10
18:17–18 8.10
22:22 9.20
26:1–4 10.28
27:26 9.39, fr. 39
28:64 6.12
30:17 5.12
32:8 4.2
32:9 7.28
32:15 9.17
32:39 8.15
32:40 5.15, 9.6

Joshua (Josh)
3 8.40
4:23b–24a 9.7
5:3 8.40

Judges (Judg)
6:16–20 4.11
6:20 4.12
13:15–16 4.11
13:19 4.11, 4.12

Ruth
- 1:1–4 fr. 75
- 4:9–10 fr. 75
- 4:13–22 fr. 75

1 Kingdoms (1 Kgdms)/1 Samuel (1 Sam)
- 4:18 1.13
- 5:1 1.13
- 7 8.40
- 7:7–11 7.5
- 8:7–18 6.37
- 15:22 10.24
- 18 9.46
- 28:7–9 6.20
- 28:19 fr. 3b

3 Kingdoms (3 Kgdms)/1 Kings (1 Kgs)
- 8:26–27a 8.42
- 11:4 7.9, 7.13
- 11:11 7.13
- 18:38 10.22
- 19:10 Dedic. 2

4 Kingdoms (4 Kgdms)/2 Kings (2 Kgs)
- 17:35b–36a 9.7
- 18:17 2.1
- 18:17–35 7.17
- 18:17–19:35 7.5
- 24:18–25:7 8.2

2 Chronicles (2 Chr)
- 36:10–16 8.2

Job
- 8:20 9.29
- 12:13 3.38

Psalms (Ps)
- 3:8(7) fr. 74
- 4:6 9.29
- 7:10(9) 10.41
- 11(12):4–5 7.22
- 13(14):1 9.19
- 13(14):3 8.36, fr. 72
- 17(18):26–27 Dedic.4, fr. 39
- 18(19):2 2.56, 3.13
- 19(20):7 8.37
- 20(21):14a 9.7
- 26(27):6 9.29, 10.24
- 31(32):9 3.10, 5.10
- 32(33):6 2.56, 8.31, 8.34
- 33(34):8 4.10, 4.23
- 36(37):8a 6.4
- 39(40):7–9 9.26
- 43(44):19 9.44
- 44(45):7–8 8.41
- 45(46):11 1.20, 5.29
- 46(47):2–3 8.41
- 49(50):2–3 10.10
- 49(50):2b–3a 8.41
- 49(50):9 9.26
- 49(50):9–11 10.28
- 49(50):13–14 9.26
- 49(50):14 10.24
- 51(52):3–4a 6.1, 7.1
- 51(52):4 fr. 73
- 51(52):6 6.1, 7.1
- 51(52):7 fr. 78
- 56(57):5 fr. 72
- 57(58):7 fr. 74
- 65(66):8 8.41
- 67(68):29 9.7
- 68(69):32 9.29
- 71(72):11 8.41
- 72(73):8 1.1, 7.17
- 74(75):6 3.1, 5.24, 6.11
- 76(77):20 3.18
- 77(78):24 3.46
- 77(78):25 3.46
- 79(80):2c 8.37
- 79(80):3a 8.37
- 79(80):3b–c 8.37
- 81(82):6 2.35, 8.5, 9.4
- 83(84):2–3 fr. 39
- 85(86):9a–b 8.41
- 86(87):3 2.55
- 90(91):11 4.10
- 95(96):5 4.2, 4.15, 8.4
- 96(97):1 8.13
- 101(102):27–28 8.20, 8.21
- 101(102):28 8.21
- 102(103):20–21 3.14, 4.11
- 103(104):4 3.33, 3.36, 4.12
- 103(104):5 3.43, 8.34
- 103(104):19 3.13
- 106(107):20a 9.7
- 106(107):23–24 4.32
- 106(107):26 4.32
- 117(118):15b–16a 9.7
- 117(118):27 4.10
- 118(119):59 9.36
- 131(132):11b 8.41
- 135(136):9 3.40
- 137(138):7 8.37
- 138(139):7–8 4.34, fr. 24
- 138(139):21–22 Dedic. 2
- 140(141):3–4 5.1

Proverbs (Prov)
- 1:6 1.1
- 3:9 9.29
- 3:12 5.14
- 4:26 9.36
- 8:15 Dedic. 3
- 8:30–31 2.47
- 9:12 1.1
- 11:25b 6.4

12:27 5.23, 10.9
12:27a 7.10
13:20 fr. 39
15:1a 6.4
15:27 fr. 60
17:2 6.33
18:21 6.1
19:17 fr. 32
25:2 1.42
Ecclesiastes (Eccl)
3:14 8.10
Isaiah (Isa)
1:2 7.17
1:12–13 4.16, 9.26
1:13 9.40
1:13–14 9.40
1:14 9.40
5:14 4.10
5:20 5.16
6:1–2 3.14
7:9 1.24, 7.41
7:14 *45*, 8.2, 8.16, 8.42
8:23–9:1(2 MT) 2.3
10:14 8.9
12:3 8.3
13:3 9.12
13:5 5.24
26:13 8.16
28:15 5.29
30:1 3.1
30:19 8.1
32:6a 6.43
34:4 6.12
35:1 9.18
35:3–4 8.42
35:5–6a 8.42
35:6 7.42
37:16 8.16
40:3 8.42
40:9–10 10.10
40:9b–10a 8.42
40:12–13 3.49
40:12–13a 8.46
40:13 3.18, 4.3
40:26 3.44
41:4–5 3.44
41:18–19 9.18
42:1 3.37
42:8 2.35
42:18 4.46
43:10 8.22
43:11 8.34
43:19–20 9.18
44:24 8.34
45:4–6 3.43
45:12 2.56
45:18 3.43
46:9 8.24
48:8 9.25
48:13 3.43
52:6 7.3
53:1 8.37
53:6 9.18
53:9 9.19
53:12 9.19
54:1 9.18
55:5 8.42
55:8–9 6.43
55:9 5.27
62:11 8.43
62:12 8.1
63:17 9.44
65:3–4 10.19
65:4 10.17
66:1 2.55
66:2–3 9.29
Jeremiah (Jer)
2:5 5.7
4:4 10.33
5:1 5.20
6:10 10.34
6:20 4.16, 9.26
7:21–22 4.16
9:22–23 5.8
9:26(25) 10.34
10:11 8.4
14:11–12 9.29
15:10 8.37
17:22 fr. 39
22:5 5.15
23:16 8.25
23:24b 4.34
38:30 3.55
38:31–33 9.45
49:13 5.15
Ezekiel (Ezek)
4:14 9.38
11:19 6.42
13:3 4.3
18:20 3.55
18:24b 3.55
20:5 5.34
20:23–25 9.43
20:25 9.44
36:26 6.42
Daniel (Dan)
7:13–14 8.43
Hosea (Hos)
4:8 9.19
6:6 9.26, 10.24
9:10 3.52
13:4 3.43

13:4b 8.4
13:11a 6.41
14:10 9.13
Joel
4(3):4 2.3
Habakkuk (Hab)
2:5 fr. 1
3:2 7.40
Zephaniah (Zeph)
2:11 9.30
Haggai (Hag)
2:6–7 3.53
Zechariah (Zech)
2:10–11 3.53, 8.43
9:9 8.43
14:9–10 8.13
14:9–10a 3.53
Malachi (Mal)
1:8 10.29
1:11 9.30
1:13 10.29
1:14 10.29

New Testament
Matthew (Matt)
1:1–17 8.2
1:20–21 10.3
1:23 8.42
2:1–2 fr. 3a
2:2 fr. 3a
2:3 fr. 3a
2:9 fr. 3a
2:11 fr. 76
2:16 fr. 3a
3:4 fr. 30
3:11 7.43, 10.25
3:11–12 10.3
4:10 4.43, 5.26
4:15 2.3
4:18 2.3
4:19 fr. 72
5:5 6.4
5:8 1.20
5:9 fr. 40b
5:14 Dedic. 1
5:17 9.21, 9.31, 9.40, 10.31, 10.35, fr. 39
5:18 10.35
5:19 9.36, 10.31, fr. 39
5:27–28 3.27
5:29–30 5.21
5:33 5.4
5:37 fr. 52
5:45 7.4
6:1–2 fr. 46
6:5 fr. 46
6:28 fr. 33
7:6 7.42
8:3 8.11
8:21–22 10.11, 10.14
9:13 7.40, 9.26, 10.24
10:20 1.34, 10.6
10:28 6.27
10:29 2.38
10:37 fr. 40b
11:19 fr. 30
11:21 6.11, fr. 77
11:28–29 10.3
11:29 6.4
12:7 9.26, 10.24
12:8 fr. 39
12:24 6.15
12:34 1.2
12:34b 1.2
12:35 1.2
12:40 fr. 24
13:40–41 10.3
13:41 10.3
13:45–46 Dedic. 4
14:33 6.46
15:10 2.16
15:10b 7.34
15:10–20 2.13
15:11 7.34, fr. 39
15:19–20a 7.34
15:30–31 6.11
16:22 10.4
16:23 10.4
19:21 fr. 74
19:24 fr. 43
19:29 fr. 73
21:5 8.43
23:27 10.11, 10.14
23:33 1.2
23:37 6.42
25:31 9.19
25:33 9.19
25:34 9.19
25:41 9.19
26:17–19 fr. 67
26:37 fr. 15
27:34 fr. 22
28:1 fr. 28
28:2 fr. 28
28:5–7 fr. 28
28:8 fr. 28
28:9–10 fr. 28
28:19 9.2, 9.9
Mark
1:1 10.4
1:6 fr. 30
2:7 10.3

4:39 8.11
6:45 6.11
6:56 6.11
7:15–23 2.13
8:22–26 6.11, fr. 77
8:31 10.4
8:32 10.4
8:33 10.4
8:38 10.4
9:31 10.4
10:21 fr. 74
10:25 fr. 43
10:29 fr. 73
10:33–34 10.4
12:42 fr. 45
15:23 fr. 22
15:42 fr. 39
15:47 fr. 28
16:1 fr. 28
16:2 fr. 28
16:5 fr. 28
16:8 fr. 28

Luke

1:14 10.5
1:16 10.5
1:32 10.5
1:76–77 10.5
2:21–39 fr. 3a
2:52 fr. 26
3:1 6.31
3:23–38 8.2
3:32 fr. 75
4:8 4.43, 5.26
4:32 7.26
5:10 fr. 72
5:31b 7.40
6:45a 1.2
6:45b 1.2
7:14 8.11, 10.14
7:34 fr. 30
8:54 10.14
9:10–17 fr. 77
10:13 6.11, fr. 77
10:22 8.26
12:33 fr. 61
12:35 9.26
15:11–32 7.44
17:33 6.39
18:2–8 fr. 31
18:5 fr. 31
18:22 fr. 32 fr. 74
18:25 fr. 43
18:29–30 fr. 73
22:42 fr. 13
22:43–44 52, fr. 16
23:34 fr. 23
23:43 fr. 24
24:7 10.4
24:49 9.7

John

1:1 3.53, 8.16, 10.1, 10.2
1:1–2 8.25
1:1–3 10.6
1:1–17 10.1
1:3 1.28, 6.42, 6.46, 8.15
1:5 2.8, fr. 77
1:6–8 10.1
1:10 fr. 77
1:11 6.42
1:12 6.16
1:14 9.19, 10.1, 10.2, 10.6, 10.8, 10.10
1:15 10.1
1:15–17 10.1
1:17 10.1
1:18 8.16, 10.8, 10.9
1:23 8.42
1:29 10.5
1:34 10.5
1:51 4.10
2:23–24 10.7
3:16 fr. 77
4:21–24 9.21
4:23 4.16, 6.16, 9.25
4:23–24 9.22
4:24 4.16, 4.17, 10.23
5:17 fr. 39
5:37 3.16, 8.7
5:46 8.6
6:38–39 fr. 13
6:63 1.47, 8.31
8:12 fr. 77
8:19 8.19
8:44 4.1
8:56 8.40
9:1–12 7.42
10:16 8.13
10:30 10.6
10:37–38 10.9
11:1–44 6.11
11:38–44 10.14
11:43 8.11
11:51–52 3.45
12:31 fr. 77
14:6 7.27, 8.48, 9.21, 9.31, 9.40, 10.36
14:8–9 10.9
16:20 fr. 77
17:3 3.16, 5.8, 7.15, 10.7
18:36 6.43

19:25 fr. 28
19:31 fr. 39
20:19 10.7
20:24–29 fr. 19
20:38a 10.16
20:38b 10.16
21:25 fr. 77

Acts
3:1–10 7.8
3:22 8.2, 8.10
7:51 6.42, 10.34
9:32–35 7.8
10 *47*, 6.31
10–11 9.32
10:14 9.38
10:15 9.32, 9.38
11:8 9.38
11:9 9.32
11:28 6.31
13:7–12 6.31
15 *47*
15:28–29 9.47
16:4 10.1
16:15 9.8
17:10 9.8
17:28 1.47
24:5 10.8
24:14 10.8
26:14 9.1
28:22 10.8

Romans (Rom)
1:3 8.17
1:3–4 9.18
1:20 2.52, 3.34
1:20–21 2.21, 2.24
1:21 1.2
1.22–23 2.5
1:25 2.20, 4.9, 6.12
1:26–27 4.4
2:14–15 3.48
2:20 4.17, 8.9, 9.21, 9.25
2:28–29 10.31, 10.32
2:29 10.34
3:3 3.43
3:12 8.36
3:13 fr. 72
3:24 9.20
3:29 3.46
3:29–30 3.47, 3.48
4:3 10.36
4:9–12 10.31
4:9–13 10.32
4:11 10.36
5:14 8.36
6:4 3.27, 6.22, 10.25
6:4b 7.43
6:14 3.50
7:12 9.21
7:14 9.37
7:14–15 3.25
7:18–20 3.25
7:22–23 3.25
7:23 3.25, 3.30, 6.16
7:25 3.25, 3.30
8:2 3.25, 3.27, 3.30
8:3 3.27, 9.19
8:3–4 3.27
8:6 6.16
8:8–9 10.2
8:15 3.50
8:24–25 fr. 7
8:34a 7.43
9:3–5 10.2
9:4 3.46
9:5 6.46, 8.2, 8.17
9:6b–7a 8.3
9:6–8 1.34
9:8b 8.3
10:4 6.22, 7.29, 8.6, 9.39, 10.35
11:13 7.39
11:15 3.52
11:16 3.52, 4.37
11:16–18 3.42, 3.52
11:34 3.18, 4.3, 10.38
12:1 9.29, 10.24, 10.25
13:9 5.2
13:14 9.7
14:9 fr. 41
14:20 7.16
15:15–16 10.2
16:25–26 3.30

1 Corinthians (1 Cor)
1:24 8.20, 8.28
2:8 Dedic. 2, 10.2
2:9 6.38, fr. 20
2:12 6.38
2:16 5.23
5:7 9.18
5:7–8 10.34
5:8 9.41
5:11 fr. 39
6:9–11 7.38, 7.39
6:11 6.16
7:19 10.34
8:4 7.21
8:5 2.35, 9.4
8:6 8.24
8:8 7.34, fr. 39
8:13 7.16

10:4 4.12
10:30 7.21
12:3 6.15
13:12 1.26, 1.42, 3.24, 4.8, 8.19, 8.28
13:13 10.24
15:20 6.18
15:21 9.17
15:22 6.18
15:22–24 4.48
15:26 fr. 13
15:33 Dedic.4, fr. 39
15:49 9.17

2 Corinthians (2 Cor)
2:11 5.23
3:2–3 9.45
3:7 4.17
3:12–18 9.42
4:3–4 1.2
4:4 8.51
5:14 9.20
5:15 6.16
5:17 10.25
5:20 fr. 40b
5:21 9.19
6:7 fr. 40a
6:14–15 1.3
13:3 9.20

Galatians (Gal)
1:10 fr. 46
2:13 9.47
3:10 9.39, fr. 39
3:16 8.17
3:29 1.34
4:6 3.50
5:20 fr. 49

Ephesians (Eph)
1:10 3.30
1:18 5.9
2:10 3.24
2:15–16 3.45
2:18 3.45
2:20 fr. 74
4:3 fr. 40b
4:6 1.27, 1.40, 8.31
4:13 10.25
4:14 2.32
5:2 8.40, 9.20, 10.24
6:14 5.19
6:14–17 9.1

Philippians (Phil)
2:5–8 9.17
2:6 6.23
2:6–7 6.16
2:7 6.22, 6.43, 8.8, 8.48, 9.10
3:5 8.44
3:19 7.1
4:7 6.38

Colossians (Col)
1:15 8.16, 9.4
1:15–16 3.43
1:16 1.33
1:18 6.18
1:26 3.30
2:3 8.39, 9.42
2:8–15 10.31
2:9 8.49
2:21 7.36
3:5 6.16

1 Thessalonians (1 Thess)
2:4 fr. 46

2 Thessalonians (2 Thess)
2:13 6.16

1 Timothy (1 Tim)
2:4 1.24, 3.54, 4.37, 5.9
4:4 fr. 39
4:4–5 7.34
6:13 10.16
6:16 1.24

2 Timothy (2 Tim)
1:9–10 3.30
1:10 fr. 13
2:15 fr. 40a
2:25 1.24
3:7 1.24

Titus
1:2 6.38
2:14 9.20
3:7 6.38

Hebrews (Heb)
1:1 8.40
1:3 8.11, 8.18, 9.5, 9.10, 10.9
1:8–9 8.41
1:14 4.10
2:9 6.18
2:14 fr. 13
3:1 8.41
4:12 1.28
6:13 5.15
8:8–10 9.45
9:10 9.38
9:28 10.34
10:4 9.20
10:5–7 9.26
10:22 6.45
11:4 3.41
11:9 3.51, 8.40
11:13–16 6.12
11:32–35 6.8
11:37b–38 6.8
12:2 4.48, 6.16, 9.17, fr. 13

12:6 5.14
12:26 3.53
12:29 5.6
13:8 10.5
James (Jas)
1:17 7.27
2:13 9.20, fr. 31
3:2 3.10, 5.1, fr. 36
3:3–4 3.12
3:5–6 fr. 49
3:15 5.8
5:12 fr. 52
5:16 5.17
1 Peter (1 Pet)
1:2 6.16
1:18–19 9.20
1:20 3.30, 8.39
2:6 fr. 74
2:9 8.1
2:22 9.19
3:18 10.34
3:19–20 fr. 41
2 Peter (2 Pet)
1:4 6.44
2:4 6.39
1 John
2:23 8.19
5:6 1.33
Jude
6 3.28, 4.9, 6.38
Revelation (Rev)
6:14 6.12

Deuterocanonical
Wisdom of Solomon (Wis)
1:7 8.32
3:2–4 10.16
7:2 8.38
7:6 6.33
7:21 5.24
9:16 3.36
13:1–5 2.21
Sirach (Sir)
1:1 7.23
3:27 3.1
5:5 3.1
34:21 9.29
34:23 9.29
38:4 7.8
41:10 10.12
Baruch (Bar)
3:36–38 8.22, 8.42, 10.10
Susanna (Sus)
42 2.29, 3.18
1 Esdras (1 Esd)
4:36 1.35

Other Ancient Sources Index

Abydenus, FGrHist 685
F 3 1.7
F 4 1.9
Acts of the Council of Ephesus
ACO 1.1.3, p.65.11 Dedic. 5
ACO 1.1.5, p.14.24 Dedic. 5
Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople
ACO 2.2.1, p.316.11–318.10 fr. 13
Aelian
Varia Historia (*VH*)
5.12 6.29
Aeneas
Theophrastus *8*
6.1–2 7.35
49.5–16 *53 n.226*
Aeschylus
Choephoroi (*Ch.*)
697 5.26
Aetius (see also Ps-Plutarch, *Placita*)
Placita (*Plac.*) *38*, 1.4, 2.14
1.proem.2 5.35
1.proem.3 1.17
Alcinous
Didascalicus (*Didasc.*)
2 2.6
28.3 3.17
28.4 5.36
34.5 1.17
Alexander of Aphrodisias
de Fato 2.39
27 3.9
de Providentia (*de Prov.*)
fr. 1 Riedweg 3.13
fr. 2 Riedweg 2.39
fr. 3 Riedweg 3.13
fr. 4 Riedweg 4.26
fr. 5 Riedweg 3.9
fr. 6 Riedweg 3.17, 5.9
fr. 7 Riedweg 5.9
Alexander of Lycopolis
De Placitis Manichaeorum (*Man.*)
25 9.2
Alexander Polyhistor
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
273 F 79 1.7, 1.9

12:6 5.14
12:26 3.53
12:29 5.6
13:8 10.5
James (Jas)
1:17 7.27
2:13 9.20, fr. 31
3:2 3.10, 5.1, fr. 36
3:3–4 3.12
3:5–6 fr. 49
3:15 5.8
5:12 fr. 52
5:16 5.17
1 Peter (1 Pet)
1:2 6.16
1:18–19 9.20
1:20 3.30, 8.39
2:6 fr. 74
2:9 8.1
2:22 9.19
3:18 10.34
3:19–20 fr. 41
2 Peter (2 Pet)
1:4 6.44
2:4 6.39
1 John
2:23 8.19
5:6 1.33
Jude
6 3.28, 4.9, 6.38
Revelation (Rev)
6:14 6.12

Deuterocanonical
Wisdom of Solomon (Wis)
1:7 8.32
3:2–4 10.16
7:2 8.38
7:6 6.33
7:21 5.24
9:16 3.36
13:1–5 2.21
Sirach (Sir)
1:1 7.23
3:27 3.1
5:5 3.1
34:21 9.29
34:23 9.29
38:4 7.8
41:10 10.12
Baruch (Bar)
3:36–38 8.22, 8.42, 10.10
Susanna (Sus)
42 2.29, 3.18
1 Esdras (1 Esd)
4:36 1.35

Other Ancient Sources Index

Abydenus, FGrHist 685
F 3 1.7
F 4 1.9
Acts of the Council of Ephesus
ACO 1.1.3, p.65.11 Dedic. 5
ACO 1.1.5, p.14.24 Dedic. 5
Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople
ACO 2.2.1, p.316.11–318.10 fr. 13
Aelian
Varia Historia (*VH*)
5.12 6.29
Aeneas
Theophrastus *8*
6.1–2 7.35
49.5–16 *53 n.226*
Aeschylus
Choephoroi (*Ch.*)
697 5.26
Aetius (see also Ps-Plutarch, *Placita*)
Placita (*Plac.*) *38*, 1.4, 2.14
1.proem.2 5.35
1.proem.3 1.17
Alcinous
Didascalicus (*Didasc.*)
2 2.6
28.3 3.17
28.4 5.36
34.5 1.17
Alexander of Aphrodisias
de Fato 2.39
27 3.9
de Providentia (*de Prov.*)
fr. 1 Riedweg 3.13
fr. 2 Riedweg 2.39
fr. 3 Riedweg 3.13
fr. 4 Riedweg 4.26
fr. 5 Riedweg 3.9
fr. 6 Riedweg 3.17, 5.9
fr. 7 Riedweg 5.9
Alexander of Lycopolis
De Placitis Manichaeorum (*Man.*)
25 9.2
Alexander Polyhistor
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
273 F 79 1.7, 1.9

Ambrosiaster
Commentarius in 1 Corinthios (*In 1 Cor.*)
4:10 8.16
Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti (*Quaest.*)
31.3 3.20
91.11 8.16
Ammianus
18.1.1–4 2.7
21.1.6 10.42
21.1.9 10.42
22.1.1 10.42
22.3.7 7.15
22.5.3–4 5.11
22.5.4 6.31
22.8.32–34 4.19
22.9.5 6.19
22.10.1–7 2.7
22.10.6 2.7
22.10.7 7.16
22.11 6.31
22.11.7–8 6.31, 10.20
22.12.6 6.14
22.12.8 10.11
22.13.2 10.11
22.14 4.29
22.16.12 *6 n. 21*
23.2–25.3 7.3
25.4.8–9 2.7
25.4.19–21 2.7
27.3.12–13 6.31
Ps–Anastasius
Adversus Iudaeos dialogus alius (*Jud. al.*)
PG 89.1276d 9.25
Anonymi Monophysitae Theosophia
2.3 1.35
2.32–33 1.48
2.34 1.46
2.35 1.46
2.36 1.46
2.38 1.47
2.42 1.49
2.46 1.49
2.47 1.47
2.48 1.47
2.49 1.49
2.54 1.44
Apollinaris of Laodicea
De fide et incarnatione (*Fid. Inc.*)
4–6 8.16
Epistula ad Iovianum (*Ep. Jov.*)
1 8.16
Aretaeus
De causis et signis diuturnorum morborum libri duo
1.16.2 9.33
2.6.1 9.34
2.6.8 9.34
Aristophanes
Nubes (*Nu.*)
320 2.14
346–47 10.40
Thesmophoriazusae (*Th.*)
1192 7.20
Aristotle
Analytica Posteriora (*APo.*)
83a32–33 *52*, 2.45
Categoriae (*Cat.*)
1a1–12 6.33
6a36–8b24 8.19
6b28 8.19
7b15 8.19
De caelo (*Cael.*)
1.3, 270a–b 2.50
1.12, 281b28 2.53
4.1–3, 307b–311a 4.40
De generatione animalium (*GA*)
715a4–5 6.33
Ethica Nicomachea (*EN*)
2.6, 1106b31–33 5.31
5.3, 1131a120–24 fr. 12
5.9, 1136b10 4.36
10.7 1.17
Metaphysica (*Metaph.*)
2.3, 998b12 6.33
14.4, 1091b10 8.31
Rhetorica (*Rh.*)
1418b3–4 2.8
1418b5–18 2.7
Ps–Aristotle
De mundo (*Mu.*)
4.395b13 fr. 3a
6.398a18–19 4.46
Aristoxenus
Fragmenta (vita Socratis) (*Fr.*)
fr. 59 6.3
Arnobius
Adversus nationes (*adv. Nat.*)
6.6 10.21
Asclepius (*Asclep.*)
2.23–24 4.2
Athanasius
Apologia de fuga sua (*Fug.*)
6 6.31
Contra Gentes (*Gent.*) *62*
1 2.23
2 8.19
11 2.4
16 2.25
30 2.23
36–38 2.47

39 2.36
41 2.37, 2.47
Epistula ad Serapionem (*Ep. Serap.*)
1.5.1 3.36
Orationes adversus Arianos (*Ar.*)
2.25.2 2.38
3.14.2 8.16
3.29.1 8.16
3.33.2 8.16
3.33.4 8.16
Vita Antonii (*V. Anton.*)
36.4 8.16
Athenaeus
Deipnosophistae (*Deipn.*)
1.46 7.11
1.60 7.20
3.28 7.20
3.59 7.20
13.56 6.7
Athenagoras
Legatio (*Leg.*)
5 1.44
17 3.3
18 4.32
23 8.25
29 6.23
Atticus
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
fr. 5 2.37
Augustine
Confessiones (*Conf.*)
5.vi.10 7.20
contra Adimantum (*c.Adim.*)
11 5.15
De civitate Dei (*C.D.*) *12*, *58*–59, *62*
2.22–23 6.19
3.10 6.10
3.12 6.19, 6.22
3.17 7.26
4.6 6.10
4.15 6.10
4.20 6.14
6.1 7.24
8.11 1.19
8.23–26 1.41
8.27 6.28
9.5 5.15
9.16–18 8.49
10.5 4.16
10.9 3.21
10.11 4.14
10.13 1.26
10.14 4.17
10.16 4.22, 6.19
10.19 4.12
10.23 8.27
10.24 8.48
10.28 8.48
10.29 8.27
10.31 2.41
12.5 9.38
12.22 3.6
12.25–27 2.35
13.16–17 2.41
14.26 3.25
15.7 10.29
15.22–23 9.12
15.23 9.11
16.5 4.44
16.24 10.40
18 1.5
18.5 1.16
18.37 1.11
18.39 1.41
18.41 1.4
18.45 8.13
18.52 7.16
19.17 7.24
19.23 7.16
21.8 fr. 3a
21.11–13 5.27
22.26 2.41
22.28 7.45
De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber (*Gn. Litt. Imp.*)
8.16 3.26
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
102.8 3.46
102.28 5.12
187.3–21 fr. 24
In Iohannis evangelium tractatus (*Evang. Iohan.*)
6.10 4.31
Locutiones in heptateuchum (*Loc. In Hept.*)
1.35 4.32
Quaestiones in heptateuchum (*Qu. in Hept.*)
2.158 5.15
Bacchylides
Paeanes (*Pae.*)
fr. 5.1 1.4
Basil of Caesarea
In sanctam Christi generationem
5 8.16
Ps–Basil
Adversus Eunomium (*Eun.*)
5 8.33
Callimachus
Aetia (*Aet.*)
I, fr. 4 6.10
Cassius Dio
78.8.5 5.33

Catenae Graecarum Patrum
Catenae in Genesim (*Cat. in Genes.*)
1 3.30
Chrysippus
Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (SVF)
fr. 35 5.35
fr. 36 5.35
Cicero
De natura deorum (*N.D.*)
3.56 1.41
Clement of Alexandria
Paedagogus (*Paed.*)
1.3.9.4 1.17
1.8 5.15
1.12.98 5.29
2.1.15.4 3.17
3.11.75–76 9.35
74.4 5.15
Protrepticus (*Prot.*)
1.7.1 7.27
2.14 2.13
2.17.2 6.20
2.30.1 6.23
2.30.2 6.23
2.32–33 6.17
2.41.3 4.15
3.42.2 4.19
3.42.3 4.19
3.42.4 4.19
3.42.5 4.19
3.42.7 4.19, 6.19
3.44.4–45.5 10.21
4.48.2–6 1.16
4.55.3 2.4
6.68.1 1.42
6.69.4 3.10
6.71.3 1.44
6.72.4 1.42
7.74.2 1.44
7.74.4–5 1.35
10.96.4 6.29
11.115.1 4.36
Qui dives salvetur (*Q.d.s.*)
17.2 1.2
Stromateis (*Str.*)
1.14.61 fr. 57
1.15.69 1.18, 3.21
1.15.70 4.28
1.15.71 4.28, 6.14
1.15.72 4.28
1.15.73 4.28
1.16.74 5.36
1.16.74–77 5.5
1.16.75 6.23
1.19.93 5.38
1.19.94 3.34
1.21.106 7.19
1.21.147 6.30
1.23.153 7.19, 9.15
2.22.131 3.17
2.132.2 3.10
3.2.11 4.33
3.4.30 3.21
4.8.57 4.28
5.1.13 9.28
5.4.20–21 9.15
5.5.27–31 9.16
5.8.45 fr. 57
5.8.51–52 9.35
5.12.78 1.35, 1.42
5.13.84 8.25
5.14.102 3.34, 8.28
5.14.103 1.47, 7.45
5.14.108 1.44
5.14.113 1.44
5.14.136 5.11
5.68.5 1.4
5.79.4 8.21
6.2.20 10.13
6.4.36 9.15
6.14 3.37
6.15.115 5.29
6.17.161 3.33
6.24.3 7.35
7.3.15 3.4
7.6.34 9.24
7.7 3.21
Codex Theodosianus (*CTh.*)
9.17.5 10.11
13.3.5 7.16
15.4.1 4.8, 6.45
16.10.24 1.2
Constantius Harmenopulus
Manuale legume sive Hexabiblos
1.1.7 fr. 47
Corpus Hermeticum (= *Hermes Trismegistus*)
Corpus Hermeticum (*Corp.Herm.*) 5.33
Asclepius (*Ascl.*) 29, test. 2 4.23
4.1 2.30
11.22 2.22
12.8.6 4.2
13.17.18 4.2
13.18.1 4.2
14.6–7 2.42
14.8–10 2.42
fr. 23 1.48
fr. 24 1.49
fr. 25 1.43
fr. 26 1.44

fr. 28 1.46
fr. 29 1.46
fr. 30 1.46
fr. 31 2.30
fr. 32a 2.30
fr. 32b 2.30
fr. 33 2.30
fr. 34 2.31
fr. 35 8.31
TH 21 1.41
Cyril of Alexandria
Commentarius in 2 Cor. (*2 Cor.*)
10:2–3 6.45
Commentarius in Aggeum (*Agg.*)
2:9 6.19
Commentarius in Hebraeos (*Heb.*)
9:10 10.25
11:7 3.41
12:2 9.17
12:18 8.7
Commentarius in Isaiam (*Is.*) *4 n. 10*
1:1 5.18
10:5–10 fr. 63
13:13 5.18
14:4–7 fr. 54
15:1 5.18
16:7 fr. 54
17:12–13 6.4
18:1–2 4.22
19:20–21 6.39
25:1 3.30
30:25 8.3
33:20–21 8.3
41:16–17 8.30
44:8 5.18
45:8 6.19, 9.29
45:14–16 9.18
47:8–10 fr. 54
49:8–12 fr. 14
49:25 6.39
51:22–23 6.39
55:12 6.19
60:20–21 6.19
61:10–11 6.38
Commentarius in Joannis Evangelium (*Jo.*)
1:11 10.6
1:17 2.19, 8.30
1:32–33 8.30
3:36 8.30
5:16–17 fr. 39
5:23 9.5
5:37–38 8.7
5:46 8.8
6:8–10 2.19
6:61–62 9.18
8:32 8.40
9:31 7.34
9:34 10.2
9:37 9.18
10:14–15 2.19
14:1 9.18
14:8 10.2
14:24 9.18
17:24 3.30
19:25 fr. 4
20:1–9 fr. 28
20:30–31 9.18
Commentarius in Malachi (*Mal.*)
1:8 6.19
2:14–15 8.30
3:6–7 7.13
4:1 6.32
Commentarius in Matthaei Evangelium (*Mt.*)
fr. 219 fr. 43
Commentarius in Michaeam (*Mich.*)
7:14–15 1.17
Commentarius in Nahum (*Nah.*)
praef. fr. 14
Commentarius in Osee (*Os.*)
1:3 9.38, fr. 14
Commentarius in duodecim prophetas (*Comm. xii proph.*) *4 n. 10*
Commentarius in Psalmos (*Ps.*)
36:8 5.29
38:9 9.29
44:12–13 7.43
49:5 9.29
50:7 9.29
103:35 7.40
Commentarius in Romanos (*Rom.*)
10:4 9.31, 9.40, 10.35
14:16 9.47
Commentarius in Zachariam (*Zach.*)
13:2 6.20
Contra Nestorium (*Nest.*) *13 n. 54*
5.5 9.29
De adoratione in spiritu et veritate (*Ador.*) *4 n. 10*, 4.16
1, PG 68.133b–136a 9.21
1, PG 68.172a 6.40
1, PG 68.184c 6.40
1, PG 68.205a 6.38
1, PG 68.205b 3.3, 7.12, 7.13
2, PG 68.252a 8.20
6, PG 68.408–77 5.2
6, PG 68.424a 4.36
6, PG 68.445a 6.20
6, PG 68.449a–b 4.5
6, PG 68.449d 4.28

6, PG 68.449d–452a 5.25
6, PG 68.456b 7.34
6, PG 68.461d 4.21
6, PG 68.469a 10.42
6, PG 68.469b 3.3, 7.12
7, PG 68.489 8.7
7, PG 68.505d–513d 5.3
11, PG 68.761a 6.19
12, PG 68.836a–b 9.41
12, PG 68.840b 9.19
14, PG 68.908b–c 5.18
14, PG 68.913–37 9.35
14, PG 68.917a 9.38
14, PG 68.937b fr. 63
16, PG 68.1056b 6.19
De incarnatione unigeniti (*Inc. Unigen.*)
689–90 9.18
De recta fide
4 6.19
De recta fide ad Arcadiam et Marinam (*Arcad.*)
ACO 1.1.5, pp.70–94 10.2
De recta fide ad Pulcheriam et Eudochiam (*Pulch.*)
121 (ACO 1.1.5, p.92.12–15) 10.5
Dialogi de Trinitate (*Dial. Trin.*) *3 n. 5*, *4 n. 9*, *4 n. 10*
1.389 1.24
3.502 6.19
4.524 2.37
4.542 7.34
5.559 8.20
5.565 8.20
6.613 6.32
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
2.3 *3 n. 5*
41 9.14, 9.18
83 9.14
Epistulae Festales sive Homiliae Paschales (*Ep. Fest.*) *2*, *5*
2.2 2.19
4.3 7.14
5.7 3.30
6.4 2.47
8.6 9.18
10.1 6.39
11.6 fr. 63
11.5 6.7
11.8 9.18
12–14 *5*
12.2 6.7
14.2 7.11
15 *5*
15.3 8.18, 8.35, 8.37, 8.38, 8.48, 8.49
15.4 8.7, 8.8, 8.35
16.6 6.32
18 7.11
19.2 9.41
23.3 9.25
24.3 8.30
28.4 6.12
Glaphyra (*Glaph.*) *4 n. 10*
Gen. 1, PG 69.21b 3.18
Gen. 1, PG 69.36b 10.29
Gen. 1, PG 69.44d 2.7
Gen. 1, PG 69.48a–b 9.12
Gen. 2, PG 69.53c–d 9.11
Gen. 2, PG 69.68c 2.7
Gen. 2, PG 69.73b 2.7
Gen. 2, PG 69.89d 2.7
Gen. 2, PG 69.93a 9.29
Gen. 2, PG 69.105c 6.19
Gen. 3, PG 69.116a 6.19
Gen. 3, PG 69.120a–d 10.40
Gen. 3, PG 69.129c 9.18
Gen. 3, PG 69.172a 2.7
Gen. 4, PG 69.212b 2.7
Gen. 5, PG 69.280d 6.9
Gen. 5, PG 69.284b 7.43
Gen. 7, PG 69.348c 6.40
Ex. (pt. 1), PG 69.409a 6.19
Ex. (pt. 3), PG 69.497c 2.19
Lev., PG 69.560c 9.18
Lev., PG 69.585c–589b 9.14
Num., PG 69.597b 2.19
Homiliarum fragmenta (*Hom. fr.*)
fr. 6 8.41
Homiliae in Lucae Evangelium (*Hom. Lc.*)
9:59 (97.21–26 Sickenberger) 10.14
13:25 (PG 72.777c) 2.19
18:20f (PG 72.857c) fr. 43
123 (338.15–17 Payne Smith) fr. 43
146 fr. 16
Quod unus sit Christus (*Chr. un.*)
722 6.32
Responsio ad Tiberium (*Resp.*)
11 9.46
14 9.4
15 9.11, 9.12
Thesaurus (*Thes.*) 9.36
prol., PG 75.12b–c 4.1
IX, PG 75.117a 9.8
XXXV, PG 75.617–56 9.5
XXXV, PG 75.641 9.5
Cyril of Jerusalem
Catecheses (*Catech.*)
4.10 6.15
4.14 6.15
10.19 6.15, 8.16

12.8 6.15
13.4 6.15
13.36 6.15
Damascius
The Philosophical History (Isid. = Vita Isidori)
Isid. 115A *11 n. 46*
Demosthenes
De corona (*De cor.*)
208 6.28, 10.13
Dialogus anonymus adversus Iudaeos (*Dial. anon.*)
I.178–202 3.20
Didymus the Blind
In Genesim (*Gen.*)
3:9–12 (SC 233.214) 2.53
3:14 (SC 233.224–30) 3.20
3:22 (SC 233.258) 4.44
4:1–2 (SC 233.275) 3.26
4:26 (SC 233.332) 9.12
6:2 (SC 244.22) 9.2
In Psalmos (*Ps.*)
34:11 3.26
In Zacchariam (*Zach.*)
1.266 1.17
2.363 3.26
Didymus (?)
De Trinitate (*Trin.*) *55 n. 240*
1.8 2.36
1.26 9.40
1.36 9.25
2.8 2.37
2.18 3.53
2.19 1.24
2.27 1.47, 1.48, 1.49, 8.27
3.4 1.4
3.10 9.29
3.41 8.18
Diodorus Siculus
1.28.1 5.33
1.69.5 5.36
1.94.1 1.19
1.94.2 1.19
1.94.3 5.36
2.8.7 5.33
2.9.4 5.33
4.69.5 10.40
5.49.2 6.19
9.19.1 3.22
10.31 6.7
15.7 2.19
17.115.6 6.29
20.14 4.19
Diogenes Laertius
2.20 6.3
3.19 2.19
4.50.7 fr. 1
7.92 1.17
8.3 10.19
8.77 7.35
Dionysius Bar Salibi
Commentarii in Evangelia
p.58 Sedlácek/Chabot fr. 75
pp.100–101 Sedlácek/Chabot fr. 3b
p.109 Sedlácek/Chabot fr. 76
Dionysius of Alexandria
De natura (*De nat.*)
fr. 2 4.40
Dionysius of Halicarnassus
Antiquitates Romanae (*Ant. Rom.*)
2.18 6.14
2.59 6.14
2.63 6.14
2.71 6.15
2.75 6.14
4.59–61 6.15
4.62 6.15
Rhetorica (*Rhet.*)
5 Dedic. 1
Elias
In Porphyrii isagogen
10 *10*
Empedocles
fr. 17D–K2.46 2.46
fr. 117D–K7.35 7.35
fr. 128D–K9.24 9.24
Ephrem the Syrian
Hymns against Julian 7.3
3.17 2.2
Epictetus
Dissertationes (*Diss.*)
4.7.6 2.2
Epiphanius
Ancoratus (*Anc.*)
30.4 8.16
52.3 3.8
75.6 8.16
86.6 1.4
Panarion adversus Haereses (*Haer.*)
2.1 1.6
33.3 9.13
Epistle of Barnabas (*Barn.*)
10 9.35
Eunapius
Historica fragmenta (*Hist.*) *11*
fr. 25.1 2.7
Vitae Philosophorum et Sophistarum (*VS*) *11*
2.1 3.8
5.1 3.8
6.11 10.11

7.3.7 10.42
7.5–52 Dedic. 4
Eupolemus
fr. 1 7.19
Euripides
Alcestis (*Alc.*)
3–4 6.23
769–71 10.41
Bacchae (*Ba.*)
3 4.21
349 4.21, 7.17
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
fr. 1024 Dedic.4, fr. 39
Hippolytus (*Hipp.*) 6.10
1058–59 10.42
Melanippe Sapiens (*Melanipp. Sap.*)
fr. 4 4.28
Orestes (*Or.*)
413 6.2
694–95 9.25
Troades (*Tr.*)
65–66 5.31
67–68 5.31
69 5.31
70 5.31
71 5.31
Eusebius of Caesarea
Chronicon (*Chron.*) *37*, 1.5, 1.10, 1.13, 1.16
I, p.10.19–20 Karst 1.7
I, p.10.22–33 Karst 1.7
I, p.12.10–14 Karst 1.9
I, p.16.12–29 Karst 1.7
I, p.17.12–21 Karst 1.9
I, p.26.21–22 Karst 3.51
I, p.38.34 Karst 3.51
I, p.42.32 Karst 3.51
I, p.45.20–21 Karst 3.51
I, p.53.29–30 Karst 3.51
I, p.59.26 Karst 3.51
I, p.64.14–15 Karst 3.51
II, p.168 Karst 10.20, fr. 42
II, p.172 Karst 7.10
II, p.174 Karst 7.10
II, p.177 Karst 7.10
II, p.187 Karst 5.25
II, p.15.4–5 Helm 3.51
II, p.54b.15–26 Helm 10.20, fr. 42
II, p.63b.9–11 Helm 7.10
II, p.66a.9–26 Helm 7.10
II, p.70a.15–16 Helm 3.51
II, p.71b.4–7 Helm 7.10
II, p.99b.18–21 Helm 5.25
II, p.174.5 Helm 3.51
II, p.250.23 Helm 3.51
Commentarius in Isaiam (*Is.*)
1.65.56 9.2
Commentarius in Psalmos (*Ps.*)
88:9–11 LXX 4.13
Contra Marcellum (*Marcell.*)
2.1.4 8.16
De martyribus Palaestinae (*M.P.*)
1.1 7.14
De vita Constantini (*V.C.*)
3.43.2 8.16
Demonstratio Evangelica (*D.e.*)
1.1.12 1.4
1.2–3 9.39
1.3.2–3 10.31
1.10.6–7 10.26
2.2.10 3.53
3.2 8.8
3.3.6 5.38
3.3.10 2.37
4.6.9–10 4.2
4.10.13 6.20
4.12.7 6.20
4.12.9 6.20
4.13.1 8.49
6.20.11–12 6.20
8.1 8.2
9.1.11–13 fr. 3a
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*)
1.6.1–4 8.2
1.6.1–8 8.13
1.6.2 8.13
1.7.1–17 fr. 75
1.7.17 8.14
5.8.2–4 10.1
6.8.1–2 7.36
6.19.7 7.28, 10.40
Onomasticon (*Onomast.*)
1 1.6
350 2.3
Praeparatio Evangelica (*P.e.*) *32–33*, *58*, *62*, 2.14
1.1.11 2.2
1.4.5 6.20
1.4.6 4.33
1.7.16 1.39
1.8.15–16 5.39
1.8.17–18 5.40
1.9–10 4.32
1.9.15 3.37
1.9.29 6.30
1.10.26 5.33
2.1–6 4.32
2.2.53–61 6.23
2.3.23 6.20
2.4.5 5.32
2.5.5 6.23

2.6.1–7 10.21
2.7.1 8.25
2.7.1–2 3.4
2.7.4–8 2.4
2.8.2 6.14
3.13.19 6.23
4.1.1–2 *32 n. 177*
4.9.3 10.20
4.10.4 4.18
4.11 2.37
4.13 2.37
4.14.7 9.24
4.15.2 9.24
4.15.4–9 4.18
4.16 4.19, 6.19
4.17.4 6.20
4.18 4.13
4.22 4.13
5.2.1 4.2
5.4.9 9.2
5.10.10 4.14
5.34.2 6.29
6.10.5–9 7.33
6.10.16 4.33
7.2 6.45
7.2.2 6.23
7.16 4.2
8.7.1 9.20
9.3.21 5.38
9.6.3 6.14
9.6.3–4 6.14
9.6.5 4.28
9.10.4 5.38
9.12.1–5 1.7
9.14.12 1.9
9.15.1 1.9
9.18.20–21 4.44
9.26 7.19
10 1.5
10.4.19 1.18
10.6.1 6.23
10.7.17 5.25
10.12.21 7.19
11.4.6 7.9
11.5.1 7.9
11.5.5 7.6
11.5.7 7.6
11.7.1 7.9
11.7.3–5 7.9
11.11 8.21
11.11.1 8.21
11.11.14–15 8.21
11.13.2 8.21
11.13.3 8.21
11.13.5 3.10
11.16.1 8.28
11.16.2 8.28
11.17.7 8.30
11.17.8 8.31
11.17.10 4.42
11.18 2.48
11.18.1–3 8.29
11.18.6 8.29
11.18.19 3.35
11.18.20–21 3.35
11.19.1 8.44
11.20 1.47
11.21.2 2.37
11.26.5 4.13
11.29.1 3.38
11.32.3 2.54
11.35.2 7.45
13.1–4 2.4
13.1.1 8.25
13.1.1–2 3.4
13.11.1 6.28
13.12.5 1.35
13.13.28 8.28
13.13.30 7.45
13.13.40 1.44
13.14.5 3.4, 8.25
14–15 1.4
14.14.6 2.46
14.16.1–10 1.39
14.22.2 6.6
14.25.3 4.40
15.5.2 2.37
15.34 2.15
15.35 2.15
15.62.1–6 5.39
Quaestiones ad Marinum (*Qu. Marin.*)
1 fr. 28
2.6 8.16
2.6–7 fr. 28
4 fr. 28
Quaestiones ad Stephanum (*Qu. Steph.*)
1.10 8.14
4 fr. 75
Quaestiones ad Stephanum, Supplementum (*Qu. Steph. suppl.*)
13 8.16
Theophania (*Theoph.*)
2.31 8.25
Eusebius (?)
Contra Hieroclem (*Hierocl.*)
2.25–27 3.37
6.37–38 2.37
31 3.22
34 3.22
Eusebius of Emesa
Commentarius in Genesim (*Gen.*)
fr. 16 9.12

Ps–Eustathius
Commentarius in Hexaemeron (*Hex.*)
PG 18.753b 4.31
Facundus of Hermiane
Pro defensione trium capitulorum
4.2.61–64 8.16
Florilegium Cyrillianum (*Flor. Cyrill.*) *49*, *51–52*
176 *49 n. 204*, 6.32
177 *49 n. 204*, 8.49
178 *49 n. 205*, fr. 25, fr. 26
179 *49 n. 205*, fr. 8, fr. 14, fr. 15
180 *49 n. 205*, fr. 21, fr. 24
Florilegium Laurentianum
L^{c} cap. A 7, 58 fr. 20
L^{c} cap. A 7, 59 fr. 65
Galen
De compositione medicamentorum (*Comp. Medicament.*)
12.633 7.20
De usu partium (*UP*)
11.14 4.40
George of B^{c}eltan
Commentary on Matthew *54*, fr. 3b, fr. 75, fr. 76
George Syncellus
Chronicle 1.15
Gregory of Nazianzus
Carmina (*Carm.*)
1.2.2.127 4.36
2.1.11.1240 2.46
2.1.12.662 2.46
2.1.39.102 2.46
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
101.16 8.16
101.18–21 9.18
102.4 9.18
Orationes (*Or.*)
4 *29*, 7.16
4.14 8.16
4.43 1.4
4.47 10.42
4.52 Dedic. 4
4.72 2.19
4.74 2.2
4.76 2.2
4.98 6.32
4.110 2.1
4.113 1.17
5 *29*, 7.16
5.20 2.7
5.25 2.2
22.13 9.18
28.4 1.43
29.2 1.4
37.2 9.18
Gregory of Nyssa
De anima et resurrectione (*Anim. et. Res.*)
p. 76 5.11
De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti (*Deit.*)
PG 46.568d 4.21
De hominis opificio (*Hom. Opif.*)
16 5.11
20 3.26
De tridua inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Jesu Christi spatio
pp. 290–94 fr. 24
De virginitate (*Virg.*)
14.1 8.16
19.1 8.16
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
3.24 8.16
Homilia de Nativitate (*Nativ.*)
1136 8.16
Homiliae in Cantica Canticorum (*Hom. in Cant.*)
5 5.11
11 5.26
Oratio Catechetica (*Or. Catech.*)
7 3.47
Ps–Gregory of Nyssa
Testimonia adversus Iudaeos (*Test.*) *51*
1.5 3.32
1.6 1.26, 8.18
1.7 9.8
2 8.11
4 8.42
16 9.25, 9.30
Ps–Hegesippus
De excidio Hierosolymae (*de Excidio Hierosol.*)
2.4 7.37
Hephaestion
Apotelesmatica
170 9.15
Heraclitus fr. 1
Allegoriae (*All.*)
52.3 1.36
56–58 1.36
78.4 *53 n. 225*, 2.45
78.6 2.19
Heraclitus (of Ephesus)
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
fr. B1 D–K 8.44
fr. B 50 D–K 4.2
Hermias
in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia (*in Phdr.*)
1.49 1.41
99.6 2.41
Herodotus
1.7 5.33
1.181 5.33

2.53 3.3
2.104 9.13
2.108–09 5.36
2.109 5.36
3.158 5.33
4.76–77 4.24
4.79–80 4.24
4.103 4.19
6.127 7.11
Hesiod
Opera et Dies (*Op.*)
50ff 3.2
240 5.13
289 6.36
Theogony (*Th.*) *38*, 2.4, 2.24
104 3.2
108–10 2.25
126–27 2.25
132ff 3.2
133–37 2.25
565ff 3.2
571 3.2
579 3.2
585 3.2
587 3.2, 5.31
Hesychius
Lexicon 8.31
Hierocles
De providentia (*Prov.*)
214.2.171b–172a 2.17
214.4.172b 2.39
214.8.173a 2.17
251.3.461a 2.17
251.6.461b 2.39
In Carmen Aureum (*in CA*)
17.7.3 fr. 57
Ps–Hippolytus
Refutatio omnium haeresium (*Haer.*)
1.2.2 5.36
1.3.2 7.35
1.3.3 7.35
1.8.6 6.9
Historia Coptica Ecclesiasticae Alexandrinae (*Hist.copt.eccl.Alex.*)
II, pp.77–79 Dedic. 5
Homer
Homeric Hymn to Apollo (*HHApol*)
373 fr. 64b
545 fr. 64b
Iliad (*Il.*)
1.9 fr. 64b
1.10 5.32
1.14 5.32
1.52 5.32
1.75 5.32
1.607 3.2
2.204–05 7.14
4.48 4.19
4.48–49 4.15
4.49 4.13, 4.15
4.217–19 4.28, 5.33
4.441 5.31
5.31 4.6, 5.31
5.53 4.21
5.426 4.19
5.442 7.11
5.455 4.6, 5.31
5.747 5.31
5.831 1.36, 4.6, 5.31
6.58–59 6.2
6.236 4.36
7.109–10 6.32
8.391 5.31
9.445–46 1.37
9.497 5.17
9.499 3.4
9.500 4.13, 4.15
9.534 5.32
11.514 5.20
11.828–32 4.28, 5.33
14.201 4.32
14.302 4.32
15.36–38 10.15
15.47 4.19
16.35 fr. 48
16.433 2.4
16.440–43 10.15
16.808–15 7.35
19.258 4.19
19.407 3.20
19.420 3.20
20.67–68 1.36
20.67–73 1.36
20.70 1.36
20.73 1.36
21.394 5.31
22.126 6.9
22.304 10.12
23.42 4.19
24.69 4.19
24.69–70 4.15
24.70 4.13, 4.15
Odyssey (*Od.*)
1.1 4.14
1.101 5.31
3.6 4.15
3.236–38 6.13
6.233–34 7.24
7.294 7.13
10.330 4.14
11.305–20 4.29
11.316 4.29, 4.32

11.321–22 6.10
14.327–28 3.22
19.163 6.9
19.296–97 3.22
19.303 4.19
19.562 10.18
Horapollon
Hieroglyphica (*Hier.*) 9.15
1.1 9.15
1.2 9.15
1.22 9.15
Iamblichus
de Anima
7.13 3.8
De communi mathematica scientia (*Comm.Math.*)
67.14 3.8
De mysteriis Aegyptorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum (*Myst.*) 4.43
1.3 4.40
1.11ff 4.14
2.3 4.40
3.31 4.14, 4.40
5.24–25 4.2
7.4–5 4.2
8.4 2.41
Irenaeus
Adversus haereses (*Haer.*)
3.1.1 10.1
3.23.6 3.30
4.39.3 3.47
5.8.4 9.35
Isho'dad of Merv
Commentary on John fr. 77
Commentary on Luke fr. 24
Isidore of Pelusium
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
1.464 7.11
1219 1.17
1322 fr. 57
1358 3.8
1647 fr. 1
Isigonus of Nicaea
Paradoxa (*Paradox.*)
fr. 22 3.22
Isocrates
Orationes (*Or.*)
1 7.11, 9.31
Jerome
Commentarius in Hoseam (*Comm. in Hos.*)
III, 11:1–2 *31 n. 169*, *31 n. 170*
Commentarius in Matthaeum (*Comm. in Mt.*)
1:16 fr. 75
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
70 *31 n. 169*
133.9 3.46
John Chrysostom
Adversus Iudaeos (*Jud.*)
1 6.39
De virginitate (*Virg.*)
22.41 fr. 58
Homiliae in 1 Tim. (*Hom. in 1 Tim.*)
6 fr. 58
Homiliae in 2 Cor. (*Hom. in 2 Cor.*)
26.4 6.29
Homiliae in Genesim (*Hom. Gen.*)
2.3 9.25
16.2 3.20
17.3 3.26
20.15 9.12
21.9 9.12
22.8 9.12
Homiliae in Matthaeum (*Hom. in Mt.*)
6.2 fr. 3b
Homiliae in Titum (*Hom. in Tit.*)
3 10.20
Ps–John of Damascus
Sacra (*Parall.*) *48*, *50*, *54*, *60*, 4.45, 10.24, fr. 1, fr. 2, fr. 5, fr. 6, fr. 7, fr. 9, fr. 10, fr. 11, fr. 12, fr. 17, fr. 18, fr. 19, fr. 29a, fr. 31, fr. 32, fr. 33, fr. 34, fr. 35, fr. 36, fr. 37, fr. 38, fr. 40a, fr. 44, fr. 46, fr. 47, fr. 48, fr. 49, fr. 50, fr. 51, fr. 52, fr. 53, fr. 54, fr. 55, fr. 55a, fr. 56, fr. 57, fr. 58, fr. 59, fr. 60, fr. 61, fr. 62, fr. 63, fr. 64a, fr. 66, fr. 68, fr. 69, fr. 70, fr. 71, fr. 79, fr. 80
John Malalas
Chronographia (*Chron.*)
2.4 1.46, 1.48, 1.49
2.15 1.44

13.36 1.41
John of Nikiu
Chronicle
84.88 *6 n. 19*
John Stobaeus
Anthologium (*Anth.*)
2.1.26 1.43
4.20a.30 6.6
John Philoponus
De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum (*de Aet.*)
1.4, 13 2.37
1.5, 15 2.53
2.2, 31 2.45
5.3, 109 2.37
5.4, 117 2.54
6.27, 225 2.37
9.5, 334–35 2.53
15.3, 558 2.37
18.8, 633–34 8.25
Josephus
Antiquitates Iudaicae (*AJ*)
1.113–114 4.31
1.118 1.9
1.155 3.34
14.121 8.13
18.65–80 7.37
Bellum Iudaicum (*BJ*)
1.123 8.13
2.151 7.11
6.207 4.21
Contra Apionem (*Ap.*)
2.265–66 6.9
Julian the Emperor
Caesares (*Caes.*)
4.309a 6.37
16.316d 7.1
20.319d–26.325c 7.1
25.325a (fr. 36) 5.12
31.330a–37.335c 7.1
34.333c 5.28
38.336ab 7.38, 7.40
Contra Galilaeos (*c. Gal.*) See also (the Appendix)
Dedic. 4 1.1, 2.2, 8.15
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
46 (15) 10.26
61c (36) 7.16, 7.28, 10.1
79 (19) 6.15
89a (20) 4.46, 5.6, 10.34
89b 4.24, 7.28, 10.34
90 (55) *30 n. 161*, 2.2, 8.16
98 (58) 10.1
111 (47) *9 n. 36*, Dedic. 4, 4.2, 7.16, 10.1
112 (46) 6.31
114 (41) *31 n. 163*, 2.2, 9.14, 10.1
115 (40) 2.2, fr. 74
136b (56) 10.11
Epistula ad Athenienses (*ad Ath.*)
5.273c 3.37
6.276a 3.37
6.356c 2.22
8.280d 4.2
Epistula ad Themistium (*Ep. ad Themist.*) 2.6
Misopogon (*Mis.*)
8.342b 7.28
10.344a 7.28, 10.11
14.346a 7.28
18.349a 7.28
21.351d 7.28
23.353a 4.25
27.356c 6.33
28.357c 2.2, 4.2, 6.31, 10.11
28.357d 7.28
31.360ab 7.28
33.360d 4.2
33.361a 6.31, 10.11
33.361bc 10.11
35.363a 2.2, 6.31
39.366b 4.2
41.369c 3.37
Oratio ad Constantium (*ad Const.*)
7.9c 4.33
Oratio ad deorum matrem (*ad deor. matr.*) 6.19
1.158d 4.29
5.184a 5.28
10.169d–170c 2.11
10.170a 9.39
12.173a 4.29, 10.34
12.192a 5.28
14.174a–18.178a 9.32
17.176d–177a 9.13
18.178d 10.34
20.180b 10.34
Oratio contra Cynicos (*c. Cyn.*)
12.192d 2.2, 9.32
Oratio contra Heracleum (*c. Her.*) 2.11
5.210a 5.13
14.219b 10.34

18.224b 2.2
19.225d 5.28
22.228bc 6.31
22.228c 10.11
22.229c 10.1
23.235ac Dedic. 4
24.237b 8.25
24.237c 7.24
25.239a 4.29
Oratio in regem Solem (*in reg. Sol.*)
1.130–31 Dedic. 4
3.131d 2.23
3.132ab 7.24
16.140a 3.34
19.142c 3.37
22.144b 6.22, 7.24
24.145c 4.6, 4.40, 5.13
27.148a 4.29
31.149ab 7.24
37.152b 4.29
39.153b 6.22
42.156b 5.36
Julius Africanus
Chronographiae (*Chron.*)
19 9.12
23 9.12
Julius Pollux
Onomasticon (*Onomast.*)
9.12 5.33
Justin Martyr
1 Apologia (*1 Apol.*)
5.4 5.27
23.1 1.5
32.1–2 8.2
60 1.47
Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo (*Dial.*)
52.2 8.2
55.1 3.37
120.3–4 8.2
121.2 3.37
126 9.6
Ps–Justin Martyr
Cohortatio ad Graecos (*Coh. Gr.*) *33 n. 179*, *37–38*, *62*, 2.14
1.2 4.41
2.1 4.32, 4.41
2.2 2.4
2.5 1.36
2.21 3.26
3.1 4.41, 5.32
4.2 4.41
5.1 4.41
6.1 2.17
7.1 2.17
8.1 4.41
9 1.19
11.2 5.38
12 1.18
12.2 1.19
14.2 1.5, 1.18
15–16 1.35
15.2 1.46
17.2 1.37, 7.14
18.1 1.44
19.2 1.42
20.1 1.48
22.3 1.30
24.1 5.17
24.2 1.37, 5.38
25.1 5.17
25.4 3.10
28.5 4.29
28.6 3.26
36.1 5.27
38.2 1.43
De monarchia (*Monarch.*)
104c–d 1.45
105b 1.35
Lactantius
De ira Dei
11.12 1.41
Divinae Institutiones (*Div. inst.*)
1.6 1.41
2.15 4.23
Epitome (*Epit.*)
4.4 1.41
Letter of Aristeas (*Ep. Arist.*)
139–69 9.35
Libanius
Declamationes (*Decl.*)
48.68 4.25
Orationes (*Or.*)
12.33–34 Dedic. 4
13.11–12 Dedic. 4
16.47 6.31
16.50 5.13
18.18–19 Dedic. 4
18.178 *29 n. 159*, Dedic. 4, 1.1, 10.1
18.182–88 2.7
64.48 4.25
64.116 1.36
Progymnasmata (*Progymn*)
1.3 4.21
Lysias
Orationes (*Or. XIX Pro Aristoph.*)
59 4.26

Macarius Magnes
Apocriticus (*Apocr.*) *14 n. 57*, *58*, *62*
2.23.2–5 fr. 22
3.2.1 fr. 13
3.3.1 5.23
3.3.3 9.2
3.5 fr. 43
3.6.4 7.1
3.9.1 fr. 13
3.22.4 9.47
3.29.6–12 9.47
3.31.2 3.37
4.2–4 4.40
4.14.9 3.37
4.19.2–5 7.38
4.22 8.34
4.23.1 7.28
4.23.3 5.6, 5.13
4.25.24–26 10.35
4.27.11–13 8.49
4.27.20–23 7.31
Marcellus of Ancyra
De Incarnatione et contra Arianos (*Inc. et c. Ar.*)
8 8.16
22 8.16
Marinus
Life of Proclus (*Vit.*) *11 n. 46*
Ps–Manetho, FGrHist 609
T11a 1.41
F25 1.41
Menander
Epitrepontes (*Epit.*)
fr. 2 *10*, 7.17
fr. 7 7.16
Fragmenta
fr. 1000 5.37
Menander Rhetor
On Epideictic Speeches
2.9 Dedic. 1
Michael Glycas
Annales (*Ann.*)
2, 240 5.36
2, 241 4.29
Moses bar Kepha
De paradiso
3 3.24
Nemesius of Emesa
De natura hominis (*Nat. hom.*) 2.14
Nicomachus of Gerasa
Introduction to Arithmetic
1.1–4 5.36
Numenius
fr. 11 8.29
fr. 12 2.48, 8.29
fr. 15 3.35, 4.44
Oenomaus
fr. 12 6.29
Origen
Commentaria in I Corinthianos (*Comm. in I Cor.*)
fr. 49 4.32
Commentarius in Iohannem (*Jo.*)
1.91–4 1.17
2.25 3.37
6.3 10.1
32.395–97 fr. 24
Contra Celsum (*Cels.*) *12*, *32*, *33 n. 180*, *45*, *58–59*, *62*, 2.7
1.2 5.36
1.4 5.2
1.6 3.37
1.9 2.2
1.13 *53 n. 225*, 2.45
1.16 1.5
1.18 2.21
1.22 10.34
1.24 4.2
1.27 6.31
1.34 8.2
1.36 8.2
1.53 8.2, 8.13
1.58 fr. 3a
1.59 8.2
1.68 7.1
1.69 8.34
2.1 9.32
2.12 *53 n. 225*, 2.45
2.16 7.45
2.24–25 fr. 13
2.26 2.2
2.28–29 8.1
2.31 5.12
2.32 fr. 75
2.75 9.39
2.78 9.22
3.3 6.22
3.10–13 1.39
3.22 6.22, 6.23
3.35 4.2
3.43 10.20
3.44 6.31
3.54 6.35
3.59 7.38
3.69 4.27

4.1 1.5
4.3 8.46
4.5 4.34
4.7 3.46
4.12 4.34
4.14 6.22
4.21 4.29
4.31 7.31
4.36 1.5, 3.20, 3.37
4.38–50 9.16
4.39 3.20
4.50 2.21
4.52 2.43
4.53 2.24
4.55 3.33
4.67 3.22
4.71 5.13, 5.30
4.72 5.15
4.73 5.13
4.89–91 10.42
5.2 6.22
5.6 2.55, 3.40
5.10 3.37, 3.40
5.14 4.40, 8.48
5.25 4.2
5.26 4.2
5.26–32 4.2
5.27 4.33
5.29 4.29
5.34 9.32
5.41 3.37, 4.38, 9.13, 10.34
5.42 9.25
5.46 4.2
5.49 9.32
5.61 1.39
6.8 8.28
6.10 2.33
6.14 3.37
6.16 fr. 43
6.18 1.47
6.28 3.23
6.40–41 3.37
6.43 1.5, 9.14
6.49 *12 n. 50*, 2.34
6.49–63 2.18
6.52 3.33
6.60 3.33
6.64 *12 n. 50*
6.65 *12 n. 50*
6.73 8.34, 8.48, 8.49
6.78 3.37
6.80 4.33, 5.33, 10.34
7.3 3.22
7.6 3.22
7.20 9.43
7.28 1.5
7.36 6.15
7.39 3.24
7.42 1.42
7.68 4.2, 4.40, 6.15
7.70 4.2
8.2 5.6
8.4 8.2
8.12 9.2
8.28 7.35
8.29 9.47
8.35 4.2, 4.46
8.37 3.37
8.38 7.31
8.40 3.46
8.41 3.55
8.70 2.38

De principiis (*Princ.*)
3.1.5 3.5

Exhortatio ad martyrium (*Mart.*)
34 2.38

Fragmenta in Matthaeum (*fr. in Mt.*)
fr. 390 fr. 43

Homiliae in Exodum (*Hom. in Ex.*)
8.5 5.15

Oecumenius
Commentarius in Apocalypsin
IV, 412–24 fr. 23

Oribasius
Collectiones medicae
8.23.3 9.34

Orion
Etymologicum 9.18

Orphica
Orphicorum Fragmenta (*OF*)
fr. 377 1.35
fr. 620 1.45

Ovid
Metamorphoses (*Met.*)
1.473–552 6.17

Palladius
Dialogus de vita Ioannis Chrysostomi (*V.Chrys.*)
94.12 7.16

Parthenius of Nicaea
Erotica Pathemata (*Erot.*)
15 6.17

Pausanius
6.9.8 6.29

Philagathos
Homiliae (*Hom.*)
V.10 fr. 72

LXII fr. 73
LXVI fr. 74
Philo of Alexandria
De Abrahamo (*Abr.*)
1.193 4.25
De confusione linguarum (*Confus.*)
4 4.29
15 4.29
134–36 4.34
192 4.29
De decalogo (*Decal.*)
61 fr. 12
De gigantibus (*Gig.*)
6 9.2
16 4.40
Legum allegoriarum Liber (*Leg.*)
1.57 1.17
2.74 3.20
De opificio mundi (*Opif.*)
156–57 3.20
171 3.34
De specialibus legibus (*Spec.*)
4.106–18 9.35
Hypothetica 9.20
Quaestiones in Genesim (*QG.*)
3 fr. 1
fr. 48 fr. 1
Philo, Herennius (= Philo Byblius) FgrHist 790
fr. 1 6.30
Philostorgius
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*)
3.27 10.26
Philostratus
Vita Apollonii (*VA*)
3.41 2.37
4.27 7.11
6.10 3.22
Philoxenus
fr. 117 9.18
Photius
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
187.2–15 fr. 74
Lexicon 9.13
Phrynicus
Praeparatio sophistica
9.2 9.22
Pindar
Pythia (*P.*)
3.55 6.23
3.57–58 6.23
Plato
Apology (*Ap.*)
21a 5.27
22a1 6.9
23b 5.27
24b 5.27
34d5 6.9
Cratylus (*Cra.*)
396bc 2.17
Crito (*Crit.*)
109b1–c4 4.2
Epistulae (*Ep.*) 1.48
2 1.48
2, 312e 2.29
2, 312e1–4 1.47, 4.42
6 8.28
6, 323c6–d5 8.28
6, 323d4–5 8.28
Leges (*Leg.*)
1.631c5–6 3.23
1.644d8–9 2.38
2.654e3 3.8
3.697b2–6 4.33
4.715e7–716a3 3.10
5.728d1 3.8
7.803c4–5 2.38
7.817e5–818a1 5.36
9.854d1 5.27
10 4.2, 5.21
10.903cd 5.21
Menexenus (*Mx.*)
240e4–5 6.28
Parmenides (*Prm.*)
128c1 3.8
Phaedo (*Phd.*) 5.39, 5.40
81d1 10.11
96a5–c7 5.40
96c7 5.40
98e5 6.9
Phaedrus (*Phdr.*)
236b 1.41
241c5–6 3.23
247a7 7.9
250c2 3.35
252e7 3.8
275b6 6.9
275b8 6.9
Philebus (*Phlb.*) *42*
13d 1.41
65c5–d2 6.6
Politicus (*Plt.*)
268a 6.3
271d3–e7 4.2
297e11–12 5.20
Protagoras (*Prt.*)
309a1–2 6.5
313c 7.28
343b fr. 57
Republic (*R.*) 3.4, 6.33
1.331b1 6.33

2.364b 6.3
2.364d6 5.17
2.364e1 4.13
2.365d6–e6 3.4
4.433a8–9 2.7
5.469a8–b2 6.28
5.475d8–e4 5.38
5.475e 7.2
5.475e4 5.28, 8.43
6.500b8–d2 5.28
6.505a2 5.38
6.507a3 5.38
6.507b5 5.38
6.508e2–3 5.38
6.508e3–4 5.38
6.508e3–5 5.38
6.509a6–7 5.38
6.509d 2.17
6.510b4–511c2 5.38
6.511b5 3.17
7.534c1 5.38
7.534c4 5.38
8.544d7–8 6.9
10.613a7–b1 5.28
10.614b3–4 7.45
10.614b–621d 7.45
10.617e3–5 5.11
10.617e5 3.10
Symposium (*Smp.*) *42*
183b5–c2 6.6
210a–211c 3.34
210c3–4 3.34
214b7 5.20
219a1 4.36
Sophist (*Sph.*)
218d3 3.8
Theaetetus (*Tht.*)
174a4–8 5.39
176b 4.3, 6.31
176b1–3 5.28
201d 2.44
Timaeus (*Ti.*) *14 n.56*, *38–39*, *58*, 1.30, 2.35, 2.41, 8.21
22b 1.18
23c 1.18
27d–28a 1.30
28a 2.44
28a2 3.36
28a2–3 7.18
28bc 2.31
28c 2.23, 2.44
28c1 3.36
28c3–5 *34 n. 184*, 1.42, 4.2
29e 2.37, 3.29, 4.3
29e1–2 4.3
30bc 2.31
30b6–c1 4.2
31a 8.21
31ab 8.23
31b 2.16
31b–33a 2.16
36de 2.16
37a 2.16, 2.44
37c6–7 2.47
38a2 3.35
38b 2.54
40de 8.25, 8.34, 8.45
40d–41a 4.32
40d6–41a3 3.4
40e5–41a2 3.4
41a 2.29, 2.43, 3.24
41a7 6.18
41b 2.41, 2.43, 7.45
41b2–6 3.24
41a–d 2.33
41c 2.40, 2.43
41c3–4 2.36
41cd 2.44
41d 3.6
41d1–2 3.2
52a 3.36
Plato (?)
Minos (*Min.*)
320c 6.10
Ps–Plato
Epinomis (*Epin.*)
986c1–7 8.28
986c5–6 8.28
986e9–987a6 5.36
987d9–988a5 5.36
Plotinus
Enneads
1.2.1 5.28
1.2.6 5.28
1.4.2 3.8
1.6.8 4.2
3.1.4 4.2
3.2.3 5.21
3.6.6 4.2
4.8[6].5 3.5
4.8.6 6.22

5.1 8.26
5.1.2 8.32, 8.33
5.1.3 8.33
5.1.4 8.39
5.1.6 4.44, 8.30, 8.31
5.1.8 4.42
5.1.9 2.46
5.2.1 6.22
5.5.3 6.22
5.8.6 9.15
5.8.10 4.40
6.3.22 6.22
6.4.16 6.22
6.5.1 4.2
6.6.17 4.2
6.9.5 6.22

Plutarch
Aristides (*Arist.*)
3.2 6.7
Cimon (*Cim.*)
4.6 6.7
15.4 6.7
De curiositate 2.7
De defectu oraculorum (*Def.orac.*)
46, 435d 3.29
De E apud Delphos
391f–392a 8.21
393a7–b7 8.21
De Iside et Osiride (*de Isid.*)
354e–355a 9.15
354f–355a 9.15
355a 9.15
De sollertia animalium (*de soll. an.*)
962B 1.4
De superstitione (*Superst.*)
171cd 4.19
Dion (*Dion.*)
19.2 6.36
Quaestiones convivales
747B–748D 1.36
Solon (*Sol.*)
17 5.25
Theseus (*Thes.*)
16.4 6.10

Ps-Plutarch (see also Aetius, *Placita*)
Placita (*Plac.*)
1.3, 875f 1.39
1.3, 878a 2.46
1.6, 879c 2.22
1.6, 879f 2.52
1.6, 879–880 2.22
1.7, 881df 1.39
2.1 2.14
2.2 2.15
2.3 2.15
2.4 2.15

Porphyry
Ad Nemertium (*ad Nemert.*)
fr. 276 3.8, 3.31, 5.20, 5.21
fr. 277 3.8, 5.11
fr. 278 3.5, 3.8, 3.29, 5.20, 5.23
fr. 279 3.8, 5.21
fr. 280 3.31
fr. 281 3.18, 3.19, 8.46
fr. 282 3.31, 5.22
Commentary on Plato's Timaeus (*Comm. Tim.*)
fr. 10 4.14
fr. 16 7.24
fr. 17 4.2, 4.14
fr. 20 7.24
fr. 21 4.40
fr. 40 4.2
fr. 55 4.16
fr. 56 3.34
frs. 58–59 2.16
fr. 70 9.15
Contra Boethum (*c. Boeth.*)
fr. 242 3.8
Contra Christianos (*Chr.*) *30*, 3.21, 5.1, 5.21
fr. 6 7.28, 10.40
fr. 47 3.23
fr. 70 3.37
fr. 72 3.37
fr. 76 3.46, fr. 41
fr. 79 3.46, fr. 41

Testimonia
1T 3.37, 9.47
2T 9.47
3T 9.47
4T 9.47
5T 9.47
54T fr. 75
62T fr. 28
80T 8.16
81T 6.31

Dubia
83D 8.48
118D 10.22
120D 5.12
De Abstinentia (*Abst.*)
2.9 10.27
2.12 10.26
2.19 9.28

2.27 4.19, 9.24
2.27–28 9.24
2.34 2.37, 5.28
2.36–37 9.28
2.37 9.28
2.38–42 4.13
2.40 8.50
2.41–42 4.13
2.41–43 4.13
2.43 4.13, 4.23
2.46–47 9.28
2.53 4.20
2.53–54 4.20
2.54 4.19
2.54–56 4.20
2.55–56 4.20
2.56 4.19, 4.20
2.58 9.24
2.61 7.33
4.13 5.38
4.18 2.12
De antro nympharum (*Antr.*)
4.5 3.8
10 3.33
16.240–57 7.37
28 4.40
De Chaldaeicis Oraculis (*De Chald. Orac.*)
fr. 365 4.46
De gnōthi seauton
frs. 272–75 3.50
De libero arbitrio (*Libr. arbitr.*)
fr. 268 3.5, 5.11
frs. 268–71 3.8
fr. 271 3.5
De philosophia ex oraculis (*Phil. Orac.*)
fr. 315 10.20
fr. 324 3.8, 5.38
fr. 343 6.31
fr. 345 7.9
fr. 345a 7.9, 7.16
fr. 346 7.9, 7.16
Epistula ad Anebonem (*Ep. Aneb.*)
fr. 1.1b (3) 4.40
fr. 1.2c (13) 4.14
fr. 1.3e (28a) 4.40
fr. 2.7 (62) 4.14, 4.40
fr. 62 (65j) 4.14, 8.50
fr. (65u) 8.50
Epistula ad Marcellam (*Marc.*)
1 6.36
2 6.36
3 6.36
25.384ff 3.11
34.518–20 5.21
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
fr. 460 2.16
fr. 469 8.50
In Aristotelis Categorias (*in Cat.*)
118 8.19
137 3.8
In Ptoemaei Tetrabiblon (*in Ptol.*)
p.195 3.8
p.212 3.8
On Images
fr. 356 1.36
fr. 359 1.36
Philosophic History (*Phil. Hist*) 6.3, 6.36
(See also *Vita Pythagorae*)
1, fr. 202 1.13
1, fr. 203 1.38
3, fr. 211 6.3, 6.5
3, fr. 212 6.34
3, fr. 213 6.34
3, fr. 215 6.5, 7.11
4, fr. 219 6.35
4, fr. 220 1.43
4, fr. 221 1.47, 2.48, 3.34, 4.44, 8.26–27
4, fr. 222 1.47
4, fr. 223 1.45
Philologus Recitatio (*Philol. Recit.*)
fr. 408 3.8
Quaestiones Homerica in Odysseam (*Quaest. Hom. in Od.*) 6.10
1.1 4.14
Sententiae (*Sent.*)
1–3 9.30
4 3.5
27 9.30
38 4.2
43 3.8
Vita Plotini (*Plot.*)
1–5 8.44
7 8.44
16 3.21
Vita Pythagorae (*VP*) 7.35
6 5.36
12 9.15
14 6.35
18–19 6.36
27 3.21, 7.35
32f 3.21
36 10.27
39.4–11 10.19
41.6–11 10.19
42 9.16
43.3–12 10.20

43.16–22 10.20, fr. 42, fr. 64b
48–49 1.25
Proclus
Commentarius in Platonis Cratylem (*in Cra.*)
170 4.16
Commentarius in Platonis Parmenidem (*in Parm.*)
p.815 3.8
p.1007 3.8
Commentarii in Platonis Rem publicam (*in R.*)
1.90.15–17 7.28
1.119 4.16
Commentarius in Platonis Timaeum (*Comm. Tim.*)
1.155 4.16
1.440 4.16
1.441 4.16
2.8 4.16
2.10 4.16
3.14 3.8
3.114 4.16
3.141 4.16
De Platonica Theologia (*Theol. Plat.*)
5.15ff 4.2
Procopius of Gaza
Commentaria in Genesim (*Gen.*) *53*
4:2, lines 28–53 Metzler *53 n. 227*, 10.27
4:26, lines 2–8 Metzler 9.12
15:8, lines 113–18 Metzler *53 n. 227*, 10.40
Ptolemy
Apotelesmatica
4.4.7 9.15
Ps–Pythagoras
Fragmenta Incerta (*Fr.inc.*)
186 1.42
Rhetorius
Capitula selecta
165 9.15
212 9.15
Rufinus of Aquileia
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*)
11.24 4.19
11.29 9.15
Salustius
de Diis
13.4–5 4.40
14.1 5.13
Servius
Commentary on the Aeneid of Virgil
2.801 fr. 3a
Severus of Antioch
Letter to Caesarea fr. 16
Philalethes (*Philal.*) *52*, 10.16, fr. 14
Severus ibn al–Muqaffa‘
Historia Patriarcharum (*Hist. Patriarch.*) *2*, *3 n. 4*, fr. 78
1.12 *2 n. 3*
12 Dedic. 5
Sextus Empiricus
Adversus mathematicos (*M.*)
7.49 3.17
9.13 5.35
Pyrrhoniae Hypotyposes (*Pyr.*)
3.24 4.19
Sibylline Oracles
3.97–107 1.9
Socrates Scholasticus
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*) *5*, *51*
1.6.9 1.46
3.1 Dedic. 4
3.1.19 Dedic. 4
3.12.2–3 2.2
3.22.10–3.23.8 Dedic. 4
3.23 *32 n. 172*
3.23.13 6.3
3.23.57 6.29
3.23.32 3.29
3.23.32–33 *51 n. 216*
3.23.33 3.29
3.23.36 3.29
5.2.17 Dedic. 4
5.17 9.15
7.7.1–5 *5 n. 14*
7.14 6.28
7.14.3–4 *6 n. 17*
7.14.4 *6 n. 18*
Sopater
Scholia ad Hermogenem (*Schol. ad Hermog.*)
5 4.25
Sophocles
Antigone (*Ant.*)
264–65 10.40
Philoctetes (*Ph.*)
386–88 4.41
Ps–Sophocles
TrGF
2.618 Kannicht 1.44
Sozomen
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*) *51*
pref.21 *51 n. 218*, Dedic. 5
5.1–2 Dedic. 4
5.2.2 9.14
5.2.16 Dedic. 4
5.2.17 Dedic. 4

5.2.18–19 10.42
5.4.5 2.2
5.4.6–9 5.11
5.5.1 9.14
5.5.9–10 10.26
5.16.1 6.31
7.15.10 9.15
Strabo
7.3.6 4.19
12.4.4 2.46
12.8.2 2.46
Suda
Lexicon 1.39, 4.28, 6.3, 8.31
Synesius of Cyrene
Dion
10.5 1.41
Epistulae (*Eep.*)
54.4 5.37
74.1 5.37
129 2.39
Syrianus
In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria (*in Metaph.*)
p. 25 4.16
Talmud
Berakoth
3c 5.2
Tatian
Oratio ad Graecos (*Or.*)
2.1 2.19
21.1 4.32
31–41 1.5
Tertullian
Adversus Praxean (*adv. Prax.*)
3 3.21
Apologeticum (*Apol.*)
9 4.19
De Scorpiace (*Scorp.*)
15 3.21
Theodore of Mopsuestia
Contra Iulianum (*c. Iul.*)
fr. 1 3.46
fr. 2 10.37
fr. 4 *35 n. 195*
fr. 6 fr. 74
fr. 7 *35 n. 196*
fr. 8 *35 n. 192*
test. 7 fr. 28, fr. 75
Theodoret
Affectionum Graecarum Curatio (*Affect.*) *12*, *51*, *59*, *62*, 2.14, 6.25
1.27 6.34
1.28 6.34
1.33 5.38
1.50–52 1.5
1.59 8.25
2.12–13 5.40
2.30–31 1.35
2.42 1.42
2.44–46 6.30
2.71 8.28
2.77 8.28
2.82 8.30
2.83 8.31
2.86 8.34
2.88 8.44
3.2 7.14
3.25 6.30
3.34 8.25
3.37–41 2.4
3.60 4.13
4.27–29 5.39
4.33 2.37
4.42 2.54
4.49 8.21
6.4 2.4
6.26 3.10
6.46 5.21
6.48 5.21
6.57 5.11
6.62 5.21
7.28 4.16
7.41–42 4.20
7.43 4.19
7.46 1.44
8.1 9.16
8.26 6.29
8.30 10.21
8.46 6.28
10.16 4.13
10.38 6.29
10.86 3.53
11.43 7.45
12.62–63 6.3
12.64 6.5
12.71 2.19
De Providentia (*Provid.*)
7 4.27
Epistulae (*Ep.*)
83 *3 n. 4*, *50 n. 213*
Historia Ecclesiastica (*H.e.*)
2.7 6.31
3.8.1 2.2
Quaestiones in Genesim (*Qu. in Gen.*)
26 3.26
27 3.26
47 9.11, 9.12

48 9.12
75 10.41
Quaestiones in Leviticum (*Qu. in Lev.*)
22 9.14, 9.18
Theodotus of Ancyra
Homiliae (*Hom.*)
1 fr. 3b
Theophilus of Antioch
Ad Autolychum (*Autol.*)
1.2 3.47
2.3 4.32
2.5 4.32
2.28 3.20, 3.26
2.31 1.9
Theophrastus
On Piety 9.28
Theopompus, FgrHist 115
fr. 89 6.7
fr. 90 6.7
Thucydides
Historia (*Hist.*)
1.41 6.10
Titus of Bostra
Adversus Manichaeos (*Man.*)
2.8 3.8
2.9 3.8
2.11 3.8
3.10 4.26
Tragedian (anonymous)
TrGF Adeposta fr. 118 Nauck 9.24
2.560 Kannicht 2.46
Xenophanes
Fragmenta (*Fr.*)
fr. 21A 31.3 D–K 4.2
fr. 21A 34 D–K 4.2
Xenophon
Memorabilia (*Mem.*)
1.1.11 5.39
1.1.11–16 5.39
1.1.13 5.39
4.3.13 1.44
4.7.6–10 6.9
Symposium (*Smp.*)
2.10 3.49
Zacharias of Mytilene (= Zacharias Scholasticus)
Ammonius (*Amm.*) *8*, *52*
II, 111–13 *53 n. 226*
II, 124 *53 n. 226*
II, 177 *53 n. 226*
II, 196 *53 n. 226*
II, 309 *53 n. 226*
II, 316–24 7.14
II, 428 *53 n. 226*
II, 441 *53 n. 226*
II, 589 *53 n. 226*
II, 612 *53 n. 226*
II, 674–675 1.42
II, 942–952 *52 n. 224*, 2.45
II, 1099 *53 n. 226*
II, 1176–85 *53 n. 226*
Life of Severus
67–69 *52 n. 223*
Zenobius
3.62 5.26
Zigabenus
Commentarius in Lucam (*Comm.Luc.*)
1052.14 fr. 31
Ps–Zonaras
Lexicon 8.31
Zosimus
2.40.3 6.31

Subject Index

Abraham
  children of 1.34, 3.38, 3.42–43, 3.49, 3.52, 4.37, 8.3
  life of *48*, 1.10–11, 1.23, 1.26, 3.51–52, 6.37, 6.40, 10.25, 10.27, 10.31–32, 10.41
  monotheistic worship *37*, 1.10, 1.22–24, 1.27, 3.51–52, 4.37, 8.23, 8.40, 10.34, 10.36–41
accommodation (*oikonomia*)
  and the incarnation 6.18, 6.27, 6.43, 6.45, 7.3, 8.8, 8.39, 9.10, 9.19, 10.4–7, 10.18, fr. 13, fr. 15, fr. 26
  divine 3.15, 3.16, 4.16–17, 9.26, 10.40
  of the apostles 7.21, 9.47
  of Moses 2.29
adoption 6.44, 7.45, 9.4, fr. 40
Aetius (bishop) 8.2, 10.26
agreement
  among Christian sources 1.34, 1.39, 2.5, 2.11, 7.29, 8.3, 8.15, 8.22, 9.13, 10.1–6, fr. 28, fr. 75
  between Christians and Platonists on the Trinity 1.47–49, 8.26–33, 9.9
  between Greek and Jewish laws 9.13
Alexander the Great *44*, 7.1, 7.4
almsgiving *35 n. 197*, *49*, fr. 31
Amelius *21*, *28 n. 156*, *46*, 8.44
angels *39 n. 202* ***see also*** *"daemons"*
  as gods 9.2–4, 9.9
  assisting God 1.33
  authority of 4.6, 4.8, 4.22, 4.26, 4.40, 6.39
  creation of 2.19, 2.21, 3.32–33, 3.36, 8.23
  good and evil 3.28, 4.9, 5.28, 6.38–39
  influencing humanity *40*, 4.6, 4.11–12, 4.47, 7.3, 10.37, 10.39
  morality 7.9, 7.14, 9.2, 9.11–12
  sex with humans 9.2, 9.11–12
  under God's authority 1.49, 8.4, 10.3
  worshipping God *40*, 3.14
anger *49*, fr. 69, fr. 70
  of Christians 6.31–32
  of God *41*, 4.47, 5.6, 5.13–16, 5.18–19, 5.28–30
  of gods 5.31–32
  of people Dedic.2, 5.16, 5.25–26, 5.29, 5.35, 5.37, 6.4, 6.9, fr. 48
  of Socrates 6.4–5
apostasy
  and agency *39*, 5.7–8, 5.14, 5.20
  and worship 5.2
  of angels 5.28, 6.38
  of Christians from Judaism *32–34*, *44*, 2.9, 7.28–29, 9.22
  of daemons 4.46, 4.48
  of Israelites 4.47, 5.22, 5.26, 5.32, 6.2, 6.40, 7.28–29, 9.25, 9.42
  of Julian *37*, Dedic.3–4 2.2, 2.10, 5.23, 6.1, 6.8, 7.1, 10.13, fr. 78
  of Solomon 7.13
  from atheism 7.16
apostles
  agreement with Moses 1.34, 1.39, 2.5, 2.11, 8.3
  apostolic tradition 6.30, 9.18, 10.1, 10.17
  as "Galileans" *30–31*, *38*, 2.2–3
  contrasted with Solomon 7.11–12
  inconsistency/hypocrisy of 3.46, 9.47
  miraculous acts 7.8
Aristotle ***see also*** *the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
  as a thinker *9*, 1.39
  departure from Plato *52–53*, 2.16–17, 2.36, 2.45, 4.1
  life of 1.15
  on natural philosophy 2.16–17
  on providence 3.13
  on the cosmos *34*, *38*, 2.15, 2.17, 2.36
Arius 1.48
arts and crafts 3.36, 5.5, 5.36, 7.27, 9.31, 10.30
Augustus Caesar *43–44*, 1.16, 6.42, 6.45

baptism *44–45*, Dedic.3, 7.38, 7.41–43, 9.2, 9.9, 10.3, 10.25, fr. 34, fr. 78
bragging fr. 48, fr. 49

Celts 4.2, 4.4–5, 4.28
Chaldeans *48*, 1.21, 4.4, 4.28, 4.37, 5.33, 5.38, 9.13, 10.19, 10.34, 10.40, fr. 3a

circumcision *48*, 9.13, 9.27, 10.31–36, fr. 39
Clement of Alexandria *40–43*, *48*, *51*, *58*, 3.21, 6.30, 7.19, 10.21 *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
contemplation
  and light 1.20, 1.24, 1.27, 7.43
  and purification 7.39, 7.43, 10.33
  and virtue 7.15
  as highest pursuit *39*, 2.6, 3.17, 3.35, 4.16, 5.8–9, 5.28, 8.28
  humanity's natural capacity for 3.24
  through faith 1.24
  through grace 1.20
  through the incarnation 6.12, 8.26
  through Scripture 1.1, 2.20–21, 3.17
  transcendence of corporeality 1.20, 1.27, 3.14, 3.16, 5.29, 10.9, 10.33
corruption *see "defilement"*
Craftsman *22*, *38*, *40–41*, *45*, *58*, 1.10, 1.27, 1.29–32, 1.46–47, 2.6, 2.18, 2.20–21, 2.27–33, 2.35–37, 2.39–41, 2.43–45, 2.48–50, 2.54, 3.5, 3.7, 3.13, 3.18, 3.25, 3.28, 3.31, 3.33–35, 3.37–38, 3.40, 3.46, 3.48, 4.2–3, 4.6–8, 4.10, 4.22, 4.27, 4.35–36, 4.38–39, 4.42, 4.44–46, 5.3, 5.8, 5.12, 5.14, 5.24, 5.29, 5.34–35, 6.12, 6.27, 6.36, 6.44–46, 7.8, 7.15, 7.21, 7.33, 7.45, 8.4, 8.18–20, 8.26–27, 8.29–31, 8.33, 8.35–38, 8.47, 10.32, 10.42, fr. 34, fr. 66
creation 1.24, 1.28, 1.30, 1.46, 2.14, 2.20
  cosmos according to the Greeks *33*, *38*, 2.14–15, 2.25, 2.31–32
  from nothing *38*, 2.26, 2.56, 3.36
  humanity's imitation of God's creative action 2.40
  of woman 3.1–2, 3.5–6, 3.18
  Moses' manner of presentation *14 n. 56*, 2.20–21, 2.24, 2.26–27
cross, sign of 6.15–16

daemons *39 n. 202*
  acting through creatures *39*, 3.20–22
  and oracles 5.27, 5.38, 10.18
  as apostate angels 5.28
  as ethnarchs *40*, 4.3, 6.26
  as gods 1.2, 3.39, 4.3, 4.14–15, 4.21, 5.27, 5.31, 6.26, 7.26, 8.4, 8.25, 8.45, 10.19
  as hunters Dedic.4
  as inferior to God 1.48–49, 4.23, 5.8, 6.13, 6.20
  as profane 4.12, 4.14, 7.37
  authority of *40*, 3.39, 4.6–8, 4.22, 4.26, 4.38, 4.40–41, 4.46, 4.48, 5.2, 5.13, 6.41–42, 7.9, 8.37–38
  deception by *40*, 3.20, 4.9, 4.13, 4.23, 6.12, 6.20, 7.39, 7.43
  different from gods 7.9, 9.24
  possession by 6.11
  served by Julian Dedic.4, 7.16, fr. 16
  worship of 1.21, 3.54, 4.8, 4.19, 4.21–23, 6.19, 6.28, 7.16–17, 7.39, 7.43, 7.45, 9.13, 9.18, 9.24, 10.19
dance 1.36
deception
  and worship Dedic.4, 1.2, 6.38, 7.39, 8.36
  by apostles 6.31, 10.1, 10.8
  by daemons 4.9, 4.12–14
  by the Greeks 2.5, 6.27, 6.32, 7.9, 8.24, 8.36, fr. 72
  by Julian 10.18, fr. 73, fr. 74
  by Moses 4.43
  by Satan (the devil) 3.26, 3.32, 8.35–36
  Christianity as *32–34*, 2.2
  of Christians 6.12, 6.27
  of Adam by Eve 3.1–2, 3.7
  of Eve by the serpent 3.20–22, 3.26, 5.24
  removed by Christ 6.12, 6.20, 6.39
defilement
  and creation 1.33, 1.44, 2.13, 2.15, 2.26–27, 6.18, 7.33, 8.32
  and deception 2.2, 4.23, 6.12
  and food 2.12–13, 7.34, 9.32–35, 9.38, 9.41, fr. 39
  and vices *44*, 2.13, 2.37, 3.27, 4.12, 4.35, 4.40, 7.32, 9.37, fr. 53
  by the dead *47*, 10.11–12, 10.14–15
  of humans 3.5, 3.24–26, 3.28, 3.41, 3.51, 8.39, 10.14–15, 10.33
  overcome by Christ 6.16, 6.18, 6.32, 8.40, 9.20, 10.16, 10.25, fr. 13
Demiurge *see "Craftsman"*
disagreement
  among Christian and Jewish sources *16*, *19*, *33*, *36*, 1.3, 2.9, 6.25, 7.28–29, 8.15–16, 9.13, 9.21, 9.31, 9.39, 10.27, 10.31, 10.34, 10.36, fr. 75
  among Christian sources *35*, 10.1–2, fr. 16, fr. 28
  among the Greek philosophers 1.38–40, 2.4, 2.16, 2.18, 7.35
divination *43 see also "theurgy"*
  contrasted with worship 10.41
  of Abraham *48*, 10.37–41
  of the Chaldeans *48*, 10.40
  of Julian *48*, 10.42
  of Sibylline oracles 1.9, 6.15
deification 2.35–37, 6.28, 7.31, 8.35, 9.4, 9.12
dreams 10.17–19

eating
  and defilement *16*, *44*, *47*, 2.12–2.13, 7.32–34, 7.37
  fasting *49*, 7.36, fr. 55a
  Jewish diet *47*, 9.32–35, 9.38, 9.40–41

economy, divine *see "accommodation (oikonomia)"*
education
and polytheism *7–10*, *53*, 7.24–26
and virtue 5.37–40, 6.17, 7.16, 7.23, 7.34
Christians learning from the Greeks *10*, *16*, 7.16–17, 7.23
of the Hebrews 7.6–8
liberal arts *9–10*, 4.27, 7.6–7
through Moses' law 9.25–26, 9.42–44
Egypt/Egyptians
and Moses *37*, 1.11, 1.40, 2.16, 2.19, 4.37, 4.47, 5.35, 8.40, 9.6–7
history of 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.18–19, 1.40
in the Old Testament 3.44, 3.51–52, 4.16–17, 4.37, 4.47, 5.2, 5.16, 5.18, 6.8, 6.37, 8.24, 8.40, 9.6–7, 9.25–26, 9.42, 9.45, 10.34
wisdom of 1.11, 1.18–19, 1.40–41, 1.50, 2.16, 4.2, 4.14, 4.28, 5.16, 5.18, 5.33, 5.35–36, 6.20, 6.23, 6.30, 8.24, 9.13, 9.25–26, 10.19, 10.34
envy *see "jealousy"*
eternality
of the cosmos 2.15–16, 2.50, 3.35
of the gods 6.15, 6.18, 6.21
of God 1.24, 1.40, 1.43–46, 1.48–49, 2.5, 2.26, 2.54, 4.40, 8.8, 8.21, 8.25, 8.41
of Moses' law *47*, 9.39–40, 9.42
ethnarchs
and daemons 4.48, 5.2, 6.16, 6.26, 6.41
and morality 4.4–6, 4.18, 4.26, 4.41, 5.2, 5.35
and worship *40*, 6.16, 6.19, 6.26
as gods *34*, 8.24, 10.36
authority of *40*, 4.2–3, 4.6, 4.8, 4.38, 4.40–41, 4.46–47, 5.35, 6.41
of the Hebrews 3.37–38, 3.40, 3.42–44, 3.46, 3.48–49, 4.38, 4.46–47, 5.33–34
Eusebius of Caesarea *32–33*, *37*, *42–45*, *58*, *62*, 1.5, 4.20, 7.6, 7.9, fr. 75 *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
evangelists 1.34, 1.39, 2.11, 7.11
agreement with Moses 1.34, 1.39, 2.11, 8.3
agreement with one another 10.1–6, fr. 28, fr. 75
and tradition 9.18
contrasted with Solomon 7.11–12

Germans 4.2, 4.4–5, 4.33, 4.35, 4.40
giants 4.29, 4.32, 9.2, 9.12
Greeks
and sophistry 1.3–4, 1.17, 1.30, 1.50, 5.38
ethnic superiority of *10*, *41*, 5.36, 7.7, 7.22
history of *19–20*, *37*, 1.13–16, 1.18, 4.18–20, 6.11, 6.14
literature of 7.21
poetry of *18–19*, 1.36, 2.4, 2.25, 2.35, 3.2–5, 3.20, 4.1, 5.32, 6.13, 6.23, 10.15

harmony *see "agreement"*
healing 6.11, 6.13, 6.22–24, 6.26, 7.24–26, 7.40–42, 9.7
Heterousians 8.2, 10.26
hieroglyphs 9.15–16
Holy Spirit
according to the Greeks *37–38*, 1.47, 1.49, 8.32–33
and the incarnation 8.2, 8.14
and sanctification *48*, 1.27, 6.16, 7.43, 9.5, 9.41, 10.33, fr. 39
and Trinity 1.27–28, 1.32–34, 1.47, 1.49, 2.27, 8.32, 10.24
causing healing 6.26
creation by 3.33, 3.36
enlightenment of humanity 1.32, 1.34, 6.22, 8.22, 8.25, 10.2
guiding the apostles 9.47
participation in 1.33, 6.44, fr. 34
Homoians 8.2
humanity *see also "women"*
beginning of 3.41, 3.52, 9.12
creation by *14 n. 56*, *34*, 1.29, 1.31–33, 2.28–29, 2.32–34, 2.36, 2.43, 2.47, 2.49, 3.24, 3.28, 3.41, 4.44, 8.35, 8.47, 9.5
natural capacity of 7.27
single race of 6.33, 8.36–37
soul and body of 3.24–25
hyperbole
and David 4.32
and Homer 4.32
and Moses 2.29

idolatry *44*, 1.21, 1.44, 2.10, 2.20, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26, 3.51, 4.8–9, 4.14, 4.37, 4.43, 4.46–47, 5.9, 5.16, 5.18, 5.27, 6.14, 6.29–30, 7.4, 7.17, 7.21, 7.39, 8.34, 8.36, 10.13
images
of emperors 4.8
of gods 1.44, 4.8, 6.14, 6.17, 6.32, 7.5, 7.17, 7.21, 7.26, 7.31, 7.37, 9.15, 9.16
imitation
of Abraham 10.34, 10.36
of Christ 7.40, fr. 14
of the divine nature 1.43, 2.33, 2.40, 5.28–29, 5.32
immigrant 6.37, 6.40
incarnation
and suffering *35*, *49*, fr. 13, fr. 14, fr. 15, fr. 67
Christian understanding of *15*, *45–46*, *49*, 1.16, 3.27, 4.10, 4.48, 6.16, 6.18, 6.22, 6.27, 6.43–45, 7.3–4, 8.8, 8.17, 8.34, 8.38, 8.39, 8.41, 8.48–49, 9.10, 10.2–6, fr. 3a, fr. 3b, fr. 4, fr. 24, fr. 26, fr. 30, fr. 41, fr. 77
non-Christian understanding of *16*, 6.22–23, 8.50–51

prophecies of *35*, *45–46*, 3.53, 8.2, 8.6–8, 8.10, 8.12–14, 8.39–43, 9.10, 9.17–18, 10.11, 10.23–25, fr. 3a, fr. 67
supported by Greek philosophy *46*, 8.39, 8.44–45
incomprehensibility *38*, 1.44, 2.27, 2.31, 3.19, 7.45, 8.46, fr. 58, fr. 59
ineffability 1.20, 1.25–26, 1.42–43, 2.51, 4.34, 5.6, 5.14–15, 5.30

Jesus Christ
as a corpse *47*, 6.15, 6.18, 6.31–32, 10.11, 10.16
as God *47*, 6.43, 6.45, 8.8, 8.11, 10.1–9, fr. 24, fr. 26
criticized by Julian *14*, *29*, *42*, *47*, 6.11, 6.31, 6.42, 7.1, 7.40, 8.1–2, 8.14, 8.16, 9.1–2, 9.9, 10.1, 10.8, 10.31, fr. 72
performance of miracles *42*, 6.11, 6.13, 7.42, 10.10
purification by 3.53, 6.27, 7.40, 8.49, fr. 30, fr. 39
under Mosaic law 7.3–4, 8.10
jealousy *22*, *40–42*, 3.29, 3.32, 3.46, 3.54, 5.6–8, 5.11–13, 5.15, 5.18–19, 5.28–29, 7.15
justice *41–42*, 3.10, 3.12–13, 3.30–31, 3.55, 4.31, 4.36, 5.13, 5.16–17, 5.19–20, 5.22, 6.1–2, 6.9–10, 7.4, 7.13, fr. 9

knowledge, innate
of the divine 2.23, 3.38, 7.16
of good and evil 3.23, 3.26, 3.28, 3.48, 4.5, 4.25, 4.35, 5.3, 5.24

laws
and creation's order 3.13–14, 3.39
and ethnicity *34–40*, *42*, 4.24–25, 4.27, 4.36, 4.40–41, 5.4, 5.25, 5.35, 6.14
and government 7.3
and human agency *39*, *40*, 4.25, 4.35–36, fr. 40
as shadow *46–47*, 4.17, 9.15–21, 9.25–27, 9.31, 9.36–37, 9.40–44, 10.25, 10.35, fr. 39
transformed into truth *46–47*, 8.9, 9.31, 9.38, 9.40, 9.45, 10.23, 10.35, fr.39
leadership fr 50 fr. 51, fr. 52
legislator *42*, 4.38, 5.3, 5.23, 5.25–27, 5.34, 6.1, 6.8, 7.6, 7.28, 7.34
luxuries/pleasure
and human agency 7.11–12, 8.35, fr. 53

magic/sorcery 3.21–22, 3.37, 3.47–48, 4.13, 6.20–21, 7.36, 9.20, 10.17, 10.19
Marius *43*, 4.19, 6.19–20
martyrs *22*, *35–36*, *43*, *47*, *49*, 6.27–28, 6.32, 10.11–13, 10.16, fr. 64a, fr. 64b, fr. 65, fr. 78
Mary (mother of Jesus) *3*, *45*, 6.27, 8.11, 8.14, 8.16, 8.34, 8.38–39, 8.42, 10.6, fr. 4, fr. 28
mediation 3.50–51, 4.18, 4.37, 4.42, 4.47, 5.24, 7.19, 8.9, 9.6
Melchizedek 1.23
monotheism
acknowledged by all Christian sources 1.40, 2.11
acknowledged by Greek sources 1.37, 1.42, 1.44–45, 1.47–48, 2.42, 7.14, 8.21
and Abraham *37–38*, 1.23–24, 1.26
and Moses *37–38*, *44–45*, 1.17, 1.28, 1.32, 4.38, 4.43–44, 4.46, 5.3, 8.4–5, 8.24, 9.8
and one true God over all *38*, *40–41*, 3.48, 4.46, 6.25–26, 7.27, 7.44, 9.4, 10.15, 10.19, fr. 66
and the Trinity 1.26, 1.28, 1.32, 4.44, 5.12, 6.25, 6.27, 8.15–18, 8.24, 9.8, 9.31
and worship of Jesus 9.2–3
morality 2.12–13
and ethnicity *40–42*, 4.5–6, 4.42, 5.35
and laws *42*, *44*, 3.11, 4.5, 5.2, 5.25, 6.9, 7.6, 7.32, 9.35–37, 9.44
and sexual activity 7.9, 7.11, 7.36–38
and worship 2.38, 3.41, 4.16–17, 4.22, 5.1–3, 5.7, 5.9
and attainment of virtues 3.9, 4.7, 5.11, 5.28–29, 6.32, 7.36, 7.38–40, fr. 53, fr. 62, fr. 63
and contrast between Moses and Plato 2.19
and contrast between Moses and Socrates 6.4
and immorality of the Greeks 6.7, 6.10
Moses
acknowledged the Trinity *37*, *45–46*, 1.27–29, 1.32, 4.44, 8.6, 8.20, 8.22–24, 9.5–9
as teacher 1.32, 1.34, 2.14, 2.20, 2.22, 2.24, 2.26–27, 3.38, 3.40, 6.10, 8.9, 8.22, 8.40
criticized by Julian *14 n. 56*, 2.13, 2.18–19, 2.24–25, 2.31–33, 3.1, 3.33, 3.36–37, 3.43, 4.1, 4.15, 4.29, 4.32–34, 4.38, 4.43, 4.46, 5.2, 5.13, 5.23, 5.28, 5.34, 6.1–2, 6.8, 8.1–2, 8.4–5, 8.8, 8.15–16, 8.18, 9.2–3, 9.9, 9.31–32, 9.39, 9.47
greater than the Greek philosophers *37–38*, 1.4–5, 1.17, 1.19–20, 1.40–41, 1.50, 2.1, 2.16, 2.21, 5.34
laws of *44*, 3.49, 4.18, 4.37–38, 5.2–5, 5.35, 7.3–4, 7.29, 8.9, 8.36, 9.13, 9.16, 9.21, 9.25, 9.27, 9.31–32, 9.39–42, 9.44, 9.47, 10.28, fr. 39, fr. 67
timeline of alongside Greek chronology *37–38*, 1.11–12, 2.9, 5.3–5, 5.34–35, 5.40, 7.6, 7.19–20
myths 8.51
and Christians *38*, 2.2, 2.4, 7.1
and Greeks *15*, *33*, *42*, 2.4–6, 2.11, 2.25, 3.3–5, 3.20, 4.1, 4.29, 4.32, 5.32, 6.42, 8.51
and Moses 3.1, 3.20, 3.29, 4.29, 4.32

natural philosophy 1.36, 2.46–47, 4.40, 4.42, 6.22
Nicene Creed 1.24, 1.49, 4.39, 8.15, 8.34 *see also "Trinity"*
Noah 1.6, 1.9, 3.41, 3.51
  Greek account of 1.6–8
Numa *20*, *43*, 6.14–15

Photinus *23*, *30*, *33 n. 178*, 8.16
Plato *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
  as immoral 6.6
  held in high regard by Julian *9–10*, *38*, 2.13, 2.16, 2.32, 2.34, 3.1, 5.12, 5.38, 6.1, 6.28, 6.35
  life of *43*, 1.15, 1.18–19, 1.40, 2.19, 6.36
  on the cosmos *33*, *34*, *38*, 2.16–18, 2.31–2, 2.36, 3.24
  on the divine nature *38*, *45*, *58*, 1.30, 1.42–43, 1.47, 2.17, 2.29, 2.33–35, 2.37, 2.43–45, 2.48, 3.2, 3.4, 3.10, 3.34–35, 4.44, 6.18, 7.45, 8.21, 8.25, 8.27–28, 8.45
  on providence 2.38–39
Platonic hierarchy (procession)
  critique of *41*, 2.48, 3.34, 4.39, 4.42, 5.43, 8.26–30, 9.9
Plotinus 2.46, 4.42, 8.30–33, 8.39, 8.44 *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
Plutarch 1.4, 1.39, 2.14, 2.22, 2.52, 8.21 *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
poetic license *18–20*, 2.25, 2.35, 3.3, 3.20, 5.32
polytheism
  and authority 4.2, 4.39
  and creation 2.41, 2.43–44, 2.46–48, 3.34, 4.40
  and war 7.5
  and worship 2.24, 2.26, 6.15, 6.29, 7.17, 7.21, 8.36, 9.31, 10.19, fr. 66
  as "error" 1.10, 1.21, 3.45, 3.47, 3.51, 4.17, 8.25, 8.34
Porphyry *2*, *29*, *32 n. 177*, *39 n. 202*, *55*, 1.25, 1.38–39, 1.43, 1.45, 1.47, 2.16, 2.37, 3.8, 3.19, 3.21, 3.31, 4.13–14, 4.20, 4.23, 5.20–21, 5.38, 6.3, 6.5, 6.34–36, 8.27, 8.44, 8.50, 9.16, 9.24, 9.28, 10.19–20, 10.27 *see also the Introduction on Cyril's Sources*
prayer *49*, 2.50–51, 4.12, 5.9, 6.26, 9.22, fr. 18, fr. 54, fr. 55
procreation 3.5–7
prophets
  false 1.18, 4.14, 4.28, 6.20–21, 10.42
  from Old Testament *45–46*, 1.5, 1.34, 2.3, 2.5, 2.11, 3.37, 3.46, 3.49, 3.52–53, 4.33, 4.35, 4.37–38, 5.7, 6.8, 6.22, 6.27, 7.11–12, 7.19–20, 7.28–29, 7.43, 8.1–4, 8.6, 8.15–16, 8.18, 8.22, 8.37, 8.41, 8.45, 8.51, 9.2, 9.5, 9.9, 9.40, 10.22–23, 10.38
providence
  according to Greek sources *23*, *40*, 2.15–16, 2.38–39, 3.8–9, 3.13, 3.31, 4.26, 5.22
  and creation's order *41*, 2.29, 2.52, 3.13, 3.31, 3.38–40, 4.30–31, 6.39, 6.41, 7.2
  and human agency *40–41*, 3.5, 3.7–8, 3.10, 3.15, 3.18, 3.23, 3.30, 4.6–7, 4.23, 4.35, 4.45, 5.14, 8.47, fr. 62
  as divine care for creation 2.38–39, 3.50–51, 4.33, 5.10, 6.41
Pythagoras 1.15, 1.18, 1.40, 1.42, 2.14–16, 3.21, 4.28, 6.14, 6.35–36, 9.16, 10.19–20, 10.27, fr. 42

rage *see "anger"*
restoration 3.27, 3.45, 3.47, 7.45
resurrection *35*, *49*, 6.18, 6.32, 7.45, 9.17, 10.14, 10.18, fr. 28
Roman Empire *11*, *43*, Dedic.1, 1.16, 4.24, 6.37, 6.40, 7.1–2, fr. 78
Romans *42*, 4.2, 4.4–6, 4.19, 4.25, 4.27, 4.35, 4.38, 5.24, 5.27, 6.14, 6.19, 6.22, 6.37, 6.39–40, 7.2–3, 7.7, 8.50
Romulus 1.14, 6.14

sabbath 10.31, fr. 39
sacrifice
  apotropaic *6–7*, *40*, *46*, 4.20–23, 9.15–20
  as spiritual worship *46*, 2.37, 4.16, 9.22–23, 9.25, 9.29, 9.46, 10.24–25, 10.30, 10.36
  contrasted with virtue 9.27–28
  humans offered as *40*, *43*, 4.18–21, 6.19, 10.22
  insufficiency of animal sacrifices *22*, *46*, 9.20, 9.23–25, 9.27, 9.29–30, 10.23
  Jesus as 9.18–20
  of Cain and Abel *48*, 10.26–27, 10.29
  of crops 10.28
  permitted in Mosaic Law *46*, *48*, 4.18, 7.31, 9.14, 9.18, 9.21, 9.26, 10.38
  to daemons *40*, 4.8–9, 4.12–15, 4.21–22
  to non-Christian gods *20*, 6.29, 7.21, 10.27
saints 4.9, 5.15–16, 5.30, 6.3, 6.8, 6.22, 6.38, 7.10, 8.22, 8.25, 9.18–19, 9.46, 10.6, fr. 20, fr. 31
  denounced by Julian *19*, *35*, 2.1, 6.1, 6.42, 7.1, fr. 21, fr. 24, fr. 28
salvation
  and human agency 6.42, 6.45–46, fr. 34
  and providence *40*, 3.50, 3.53
  as knowledge of God 7.15, 7.43, 8.48
  medical analogy for 5.21–22, 7.8
  through incarnation *41*, *43*, *45*, *49*, 4.10, 4.17, 4.48, 6.16, 6.18, 6.20, 6.32, 6.43, 8.9, 8.16–17, 8.38, 8.48, 8.50, 9.17–20, 10.16, fr. 14, fr. 15, fr. 41

Satan (devil) Dedic.3–4, 1.1, 3.22, 3.26, 3.45, 4.1, 4.48, 5.24, 6.8, 6.16, 6.38, 6.45, 7.13, 7.16, 7.39–40, 8.9, 8.35–37, fr. 35a, fr. 77
Septuagint
  translation of 1.16, 7.20
Serapeum *6*, 9.15
Sibylline oracles 1.9, 6.15
Socrates *22*, *42–44*, 1.48, 5.27, 5.39, 6.1, 6.3–5, 6.9, 6.34, 7.11
Solomon *44*, 7.9–13
Solon *42*, 1.15, 1.18–19, 5.4, 5.24–27
the Son *see also "the Word"*
  as image of the Father 1.29, 1.32–33, 3.35, 9.5, 10.9
  begotten from the Father 1.27, 1.45, 5.12, 8.17–20, 9.1–2, 9.6
  eschatological judgment by 9.19, fr. 9
  existence with the Father 8.18–20, 8.22–24, 8.31, 9.2, 9.6, 9.8, 10.2, 10.6
  relationship with the Spirit 1.27–28, 1.47, 1.49, 8.18
  understood by David 9.7
  understood by Moses *45–46*, 9.2–3, 9.5–10
superstition *9*, Dedic. 3–5, 1.2–3, 1.6, 1.35, 2.29, 6.19, 6.30, 7.6, 10.18

Ten Commandments (Decalogue) *41*, 5.2
temple(s)
  as description of Christ's humanity 8.49, 10.6
  in Jerusalem *46*, 2.55, 7.10, 7.13, 9.22, 9.46
  pagan temple(s) *6–7*, *6 n. 23*, *7 n. 24*, *48*, 1.16, 1.21, 1.41, 4.19–20, 4.22, 5.31, 5.38, 6.14, 6.23, 6.30–32, 7.31, 7.36–37, 9.15, 9.22, 9.28, 10.20–21
  ritual prostitution in *6 n. 23*, *44*, 7.37
textual variant
  in Genesis 8.2, 9.2, 9.11
  in the Gospel of Luke fr. 16
theurgy 7.9, 10.34 *see also "divination"*
Tower of Babel *41*, 1.8, 4.29, 4.31–35, 4.45, 7.22, 8.23
  Greek account of 1.9
Trinity *see also "Nicene Creed"*
  acknowledged by Old Testament patriarchs *37*, *45*, 1.24, 1.26–29, 3.32, 4.44, 8.6, 8.23, 9.9
  and salvation 4.48, 9.6
  as "God from God" 8.11, 8.15, 8.34
  creation by 1.46–47, 1.49, 2.27, 3.34–35, 4.38, 4.44, 7.33, 8.20, 8.26, 8.32
  doxology of 1.27, 3.34, 4.44, 5.40, 8.22, 8.51, 10.42
  faith in 7.43, 8.18, 8.48, 9.31
  found in Greek philosophy *23*, *45*, 1.47–49, 8.26–33, 9.9
  hypostatic distinction within 9.8

women
  and Christianity 6.31, 6.33, 6.36
  and "old-wives' tales" 3.3, 3.7, 3.20, 3.42, 4.21, 5.28, 6.15, 6.32, 6.43, 7.12–13, 7.41
  creation of *19*, *34*, *39*, 2.32, 3.1–2, 3.5–6, 3.18
  negative connotations of 2.4, 3.20, 3.26, 7.13, 9.37, fr. 68
the Word *see also "the Son"*
  according to the Greeks 1.46, 1.49, 2.30, 8.28, 8.30–31
  as image of the Father 9.5
  existing with the Father 1.28, 2.45, 6.27, 8.15–16, 8.19–20, 8.25–26, 8.34, 9.1–2, 9.4, 10.2, 10.6
  from God 5.12, 6.27, 8.17, 8.19, 8.24, 8.34
  role in creation *38*, 1.28, 2.27, 2.31, 6.46, 7.33, 8.26, 8.31
worship
  contest over 7.2, 7.26
  false worship *see "idolatry"*
  in types and shadows *46–48*, 4.17, 7.29–30, 7.43, 8.9, 9.15, 9.21–22, 9.25–27, 9.29, 9.31, 9.38, 9.40–41, 9.44–45, 9.47, 10.1, 10.23, 10.25, 10.35–36, 10.38, fr. 39
  of creation *see "idolatry"*
  of the dead *43*, *47*, 10.20–21
  spiritual/intellectual *46–47*, 4.16–17, 6.16, 9.22, 9.25–27, 9.29, 9.31, 9.40–41, 10.23, 10.32